

New Series

Volume X, Number 40

November 1959

# The Review of English Studies

THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 19 1960

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

*A Quarterly Journal of  
English Literature and the English Language*

*Editors:* PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

*Assistant Editor:* JEAN ROBERTSON

---

## CONTENTS

- The Longleat Version of 'Love is Life'. By Sarah Wilson . 337
- William Cornish in a Play, Pageants, Prison, and Politics.  
By Sydney Anglo . . . . . 347
- Shakespearian Punctuation—a New Beginning. By D. F.  
McKenzie . . . . . 361
- Some Unpublished Letters of Pope and Gay; and Some  
Manuscript Sources of Goldsmith's *Life of Thomas Parnell*.  
By C. J. Rawson . . . . . 371
- Macaulay and Croker: the Review of Croker's Boswell. By  
E. S. de Beer . . . . . 388

## NOTES

- Dryden's Balaam Well Hung? (Wallace Maurer) . . 398
- A Letter of Gibbon to Adam Smith (Ernest Dilworth) . 401

(Continued at foot of next page)

---

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

# The Review of English Studies

*Advisory Panel:* H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

---

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

---

## CONTENTS (*continued*)

### REVIEWS, ETC.

Textus Roffensis. Rochester Cathedral Library Manuscript A.3.5, Part I, edited by Peter Sawyer, 403; *The Parlement of Foules*. An Interpretation, by J. A. W. Bennett, 404; A Tale of Wonder. A Source Study of *The Wife of Bath's Tale*, by Sigmund Eisner, 406; Morley's Canzonets for Three Voices, edited by John Earle Uhler, 407; The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare, by Irving Ribner, 409; Shakespeare's *Love's Labor's Won*, by T. W. Baldwin, 412; The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker, Volume III, edited by Fredson Bowers, 413; Heroic Knowledge. An Interpretation of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*, by Arnold Stein, 415; The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Evan Evans, edited by Ancirin Lewis, 417; The Cornell Wordsworth Collection. A Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts Presented to the University by Mr. Victor Emanuel, Cornell 1919, compiled by George Harris Healey, 418; On the Poetry of Keats, by E. C. Pettet, 420; Popular Fiction 100 Years Ago, by Margaret Dalziel, 422; Matthew Arnold and American Culture, by John Henry Raleigh, 424; Poe. A Critical Study, by Edward H. Davidson, 425; Joyce and Aquinas, by William T. Noon, S.J.; Joyce and Shakespeare. A Study in the Meaning of Ulysses, by William M. Schutte, 427; Essays in Poetry mainly Australian, by Vincent Buckley, 429; The Art of Drama, by Ronald Peacock, 431; *The Tenth Muse*. Essays in Criticism, by Herbert Read, 433; Studies in Bibliography. Vol. XI, edited by Fredson Bowers, 435; Short Notices, 437; Summary of Periodical Literature, 439; List of Publications Received, 442; Index, 445.

# THE LONGLEAT VERSION OF 'LOVE IS LIFE'

By SARAH WILSON

ONE of the best known of English medieval religious lyrics is the poem beginning 'Luf es lyf þat lastes ay, þar it in Criste es feste', usually attributed to Richard Rolle or, more cautiously, to his 'school'. In the most familiar version, which has been printed by Horstman, Sisam, Carleton Brown, and Miss Allen,<sup>1</sup> and in *The Oxford Book of English Mystical Verse* (pp. 1-6), the poem consists of twenty-four stanzas (96 lines). This version, in a northern dialect, is based on the text found in Cambridge University Library MS. Dd. 5. 64, III (c. 1400).<sup>2</sup> In the manuscript this poem, which we may call by Mr. Sisam's title 'Love is Life', is preceded by another on a similar theme, but in a rather different metre, beginning 'Iesu, God Sone, Lord of Mageste'.<sup>3</sup>

Versions of both these poems are found in two southern manuscripts of approximately the same date, Lambeth MS. 853 and Longleat MS. 29.<sup>4</sup> In the Lambeth manuscript the lyric 'Iesu, God Sone' is placed between ll. 68 and 69 of 'Love is Life', and the two poems are presented as one. In this form they were edited by Furnivall.<sup>5</sup> The poem is written as prose in the Lambeth manuscript. The metre of the Cambridge stanza has been lengthened and an attempt made to strengthen the sporadic internal rhyme, which made Furnivall print the poem in stanzas of eight short lines with three or four stresses in each, as against the four long lines of seven or eight stresses in the Cambridge and Longleat versions. In the Longleat manuscript the lyric 'Iesu, God Sone' also appears between ll. 68 and 69 of 'Love is Life', but the single long poem of the Lambeth manuscript is divided into three separate lyrics, each concluded by 'Amen': (i) 'Luf es

<sup>1</sup> C. Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers* (London, 1895), i. 76-78; K. Sisam, *Fourteenth-Century Verse and Prose* (Oxford, 1921), pp. 37-40; Carleton Brown, *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 102-6; H. E. Allen, *English Writings of Richard Rolle* (Oxford, 1931), pp. 43-47.

<sup>2</sup> The date of this manuscript was kindly given to me by Mr. H. L. Pink of the Cambridge University Library.

<sup>3</sup> Printed by Horstman, p. 75; Carleton Brown, pp. 91-101; H. E. Allen, pp. 41-43.

<sup>4</sup> I am indebted to Mr. N. R. Ker for the dating of the Longleat MS., which he assigns to the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Lambeth MS. 853 is dated by M. R. James late fourteenth century: this dating was kindly confirmed for me by the Lambeth Palace Librarian, Mr. E. G. W. Bill. Longleat MS. 29 is described in the *Appendix to the Third Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* (London, 1872), p. 181; and more fully by Carleton Brown, *Register of Middle English Religious Verse* (Oxford, 1920), II. vi ff., and by H. E. Allen, *Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle* (New York and London, 1927), pp. 34-36.

<sup>5</sup> *Hymns to the Virgin and Christ*, E.E.T.S., o.s. 24 (1867), pp. 22-31.

Lyf' (ll. 1-68 of 'Love is Life'); (ii) 'Iesu, God Sone'; (iii) 'I sigh and sob' (ll. 69-96 of 'Love is Life').

I wish to argue that the Longleat manuscript is right in presenting as three poems what appears as two poems in the Cambridge manuscript and as one in Lambeth; and to show that the Longleat text, which has not hitherto been printed,<sup>1</sup> has some demonstrably superior readings in the first poem, and in the two others is supported by Lambeth in some readings which appear preferable to those in the Cambridge manuscript.

As Miss Allen pointed out,<sup>2</sup> lines 1-60 and 67-68 of 'Love is Life' are a close translation of Rolle's Latin treatise *Incendium Amoris*, chapters 40-41. It is precisely at the line where this source is abandoned that Longleat concludes 'Luf es Lyf'. Both Longleat and Lambeth agree in the reading of l. 68 as 'The loue of Hym ouercometh al pyngye, in loue lyve we and dye', which makes an appropriate final line. It is also a direct rendering of the Latin source: 'cuius amor omnia uincit, et nos ergo in amore uiuamus et in quo etiam moriamur.' The Cambridge manuscript reads 'þe lufe of Hym ouercoms al thyng, parto pou traiste trewly'. This feeble version would appear to be a weakening of the conclusive original line, made in order to allow two poems, then distinct, to be joined together. The Cambridge compiler may have been misled into linking the two poems by the fact that the closing stanza of 'I sigh and sob' does closely echo the opening stanza of 'Luf es Lyf'. A similar, but more extensive, sophistication has taken place in the Lambeth manuscript to allow the three poems of Longleat to be written as one: to assimilate 'Iesu, God Sone' to his modification of the metre and rhyme scheme of 'Love is Life', the Lambeth composer frequently distorts the sense:

ll. 39-40: þe Iewyis wald not wande to pyne Hym in þat tyde—  
(Cambridge) Als streme dose of þe strande, His blode gan downe glyde.  
(Lambeth) þe Iewis wolde not þan reste  
To pyne Him more in þat tide;  
Al He suffride þat was wisest,  
His blood to lete down glide.

ll. 41-42: Blynded was His faire ene, His flesch bloody forbette,  
(Cambridge) His lufsum lyf was layde ful low and saryful vmbesette.  
(Lambeth) Blyndid were Hise faire yzen,  
And al His fleisch bloodi forbete;  
Hise louesum lijf þat alle men siþen,  
Ful myldeli He out gan lete.

Lines 44 and 46 of the Cambridge manuscript are omitted altogether.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the Marquess of Bath for permission to publish this, and for allowing the manuscript to be deposited in the Bodleian for my use, and microfilms to be made of it.

<sup>2</sup> *M.L.R.*, xiv (1919), 320.



Miss Allen has argued that Longleat MS. 29 is derived from manuscripts of authority because, although in a southern dialect, it contains rare texts, and gives the surname of Rolle's favourite disciple, Margaret of Kyrkeby. This suggestion is further supported by an examination of the Longleat text of these three poems, particularly that of the first. Comparison of the three versions of 'Luf es Lyf' with its source in the *Incendium Amoris*<sup>1</sup> shows that, in the following places, the Longleat manuscript gives readings nearer to the Latin, and therefore presumably original.

- l. 18: *Incendium*: mentem tribue illi qui *eam* ab eternis et temporalibus doloribus potest custodire.  
*Cambridge*: All pi thocht til Hym þou gyf þat may þe kepe fra kare.  
*Lambeth*: Al pi þouȝt to Him þou ȝeue  
 þat may þee kepe from care;  
*Longleat*: Al pi þoght to Hym thou yve þat may hit kepe fro kar.
- l. 20: *Incendium*: quoniam sic eum cum gaudio ualebis possidere et ipsum sine fine diligere.  
*Cambridge*: Sa þou may Hym welde and wyn, and luf Hym euermare.  
*Lambeth*: So þou may weelde Him withinne,  
 And loue Him hertili euermore.  
*Longleat*: So þou may Hym weld with wyn and loue Hym euermar.
- l. 38: *Incendium*: et dederis cor tuum ipsi qui illud redemit, ut ille sit possessor tuus per gratiam,  
*Cambridge*: And gyf Hym pi sawle þat it boght, þat He þe dwell within,  
*Lambeth*: And ȝeue to Him þat þee dere bouȝt,  
 þat He weelde þee withinne,  
*Longleat*: And gif pi hert Hym þat hit boght, þat He hit weld with wyn,
- l. 47: *Incendium*: In terra quidem non odias miseriam nisi que posset tuum purum amorem deicere et conturbare,  
*Cambridge*: In erth þow hate, I rede, all þat pi lufe may fell;  
*Lambeth*: In erþe hate þou no maner qweed,  
 But loke þat pi loue may dwelle,  
*Longleat*: In erthe þou hate no quede bot þat pi loue myght fele;
- l. 55: *Incendium*: In hoc amore . . . consistat uita nostra, meliorem nimirum mansionem et suauiozem nunquam inueni,  
*Cambridge*: In lufe be owre lykyng, I ne wate na better wane,  
*Lambeth*: In loue, þerfore, be oure likinge;  
 I knowe no betere won;  
*Longleat*: In loue be our lyuyng, I wote no bettyr wone;

<sup>1</sup> Ed. Margaret Deanesly (Manchester, 1915).

- l. 58: *Incendium*: et non erit amplius exultans et existens quam si non nisi *per diem unum* perduraret,

Cambridge: And lastand be na mare þan *ane houre of a day*,

Lambeth: And schal be lastande na mare

But as it were *an hour of a day*;

Longleat: And lestynge be no mar than hit war *bot a daye*;

- l. 68: *Incendium* cuius amor omnia uincit, et nos ergo in amore uiuamus et in quo etiam moriamur.

Cambridge: Þe lufe of Hym ouercoms al thyng, *þarto þou traiste trewly*.

Lambeth: Þe loue of Him ouercomeþ al þing;

*In loue lyue we and die.*

Longleat: The loue of Hym ouercometh al þynge, *in loue lyue we and dye*.

At lines 18, 38, 55, and 58, Cambridge and Lambeth share the errors *þe* (for *hit*), *within* (for *with wyn*), *lykyng* (for *lyuynge*), and *houre* (for *daye*), while Longleat preserves the original readings. However, the variants at l. 20—Cambridge *and wyn*, Lambeth *withinne* (for original *with wyn*)—suggest that Cambridge is not derived from Lambeth, nor Lambeth from Cambridge. This is confirmed by the readings at, for example, ll. 38 and 47.<sup>1</sup> Thus the Cambridge and Lambeth texts of 'Luf es Lyf' must go back to a common source which provided them with the errors they share; they would then seem to have developed independently. The text in Longleat MS. 29 is shown to be descended from the original in a different line, and has errors of its own: l. 12: *compileth* (Cambridge *copuls*, Latin *copulat*); l. 19: *wandrynge* (Cambridge *wandreth*, Latin *aduersitate et miseria*); l. 44: *led* (Cambridge *lendes*, Latin *conuersatur*).

The value of the Longleat text of 'Iesu, God Sone' and 'I sigh and sob' is harder to determine, as there is no known source with which to compare these poems, and no certainty that they have the same textual history as 'Luf es Lyf'. But in both poems Longleat agrees with Lambeth against Cambridge in some readings that are superior.

'Iesu, God Sone':

- l. 3: Cambridge: Reue me lykyng of þis *land*, my lufe þat þou may be;

Lambeth: Reue me likinge of þis *world*,

Mi loue þat þou may be;

Longleat: Ref me likynge of þis *world*, my loue þat þou may be;

<sup>1</sup> The following additional minor variants in Longleat have the support of the Latin source and, in two cases, of Lambeth. They may perhaps be preferred to the Cambridge readings:

l. 2: Longleat and Lambeth *whan*, Latin *quando*, Cambridge *for*.

l. 3: Longleat *the trauaill*, Lambeth *Traueile*, Latin *laborem*, Cambridge *þi trauel*.

l. 15: Longleat *couereth*, Lambeth *heliþ*, Latin *facit nos conualescere*, Cambridge *com-fortes*.

l. 45: Longleat and Lambeth *forþi*, Latin *igitur*, Cambridge *for now*.

- l. 24: *Cambridge*: And se His fayre schynyng, and lyfe þat lastes ay.  
*Lambeth*: And se His fair schynyng  
*In lif* þat lastip ay.  
*Longleat*: And se His fayr shynyng in lif þat lesteth aye.
- l. 29: *Cambridge*: I sytt and syng of lufe-langyng þat in my *hert* es bred;  
*Lambeth*: I sitte and syng of loue-longyng  
 þat in my *best* is now bred.  
*Longleat*: I sit and syng of loue-langyng, þat in my *best* is bredde;  
 'I sigh and sob':
- l. 4: *Cambridge*: His mournyng turned til ioy ful bryght, his *sang* intil glew.  
 (72)  
*Lambeth*: His moornyng schulde turne into ioie briȝt,  
 His *longyng* into glewe.  
*Longleat*: His mournyng wer turned into bryght, his *langyng* into glewe.
- l. 11: *Cambridge*: In lufe lacyd He hase my thought, þat I sal neuer *forlete*;  
 (79)  
*Lambeth*: In loue lauȝt He haȝ my þouȝt,  
 Pat y schal neuere *forlete*;  
*Longleat*: In loue laciȝ He hath my thought, þat I shal neuer *forlete*;

The Longleat text of all three lyrics is printed below. The scribe's division of lines and verses has been followed. Punctuation,<sup>1</sup> capitalization, and word-division are modern, and manuscript abbreviations are expanded without notice. Significant variant readings in the C[ambridge] and La[mbeth] manuscripts are given in the footnotes, but, for the sake of simplicity, the Lambeth variants are excluded when Cambridge and Longleat agree against it.

Longleat MS. 29, f. 51b.

*Cantilene de amore Dei*

Love is lif þat lesteth ay, þer hit in Crist is feste;  
 Whan wel ne wo hit chaunge may, as writen hath men wisest;  
 The nyght is turned into day, the trauaill into reste;  
 If þou wil loue as I þe say, thou may be with þe beste.

Love is þoght with gret desyr of a fair louyng;  
 Loue is lickned to a fyr, þat quenchen may no þyng;  
 Loue vs clenseth of our syn, loue our bot shal bryng,  
 Loue þe Kynges hert may wyn, loue of ioy may syng.

2 whan: C for, La whanne      3 is turned: C it tournes, La it turnep      the: C  
 bi (La omits)      6 is lickned: C I lyken, La y likne      quenchen: C sloken, La  
 slakeen      7 our bot: C vs bote, La oure blis

<sup>1</sup> The manuscript pointing is formal, with a mid-stop and end-stop to each line.

The sete of loue is set ful hegh, ffor into heuyn hit ran;  
 Me thynke þat hit in erth is slegh, þat maketh man pale and wan; 10  
 The bed of blisse hit goth ful negh, I tel þe as I can,  
 Pegh vs pyнке þe wey be dregh, loue compileth God and man.

Love is hottyr þan þe coll, love may non beswyke;  
 The flaume of loue who myght poll, if hit war euer ylike?  
 Loue vs couereth and maketh in quert and lifteth to heuynrike; 15  
 Loue rauyssheth Crist into our hert, I wot no lust hit lyke.

Ler to loue, if þou wil lyve when þou shal hethen far.  
 Al þi þoght to Hym thou yve þat may hit kepe fro kar.  
 Loke þi hert fro Hym nat twyn, pogh þou in wandrynge war,  
 So þou may Hym weld with wyn, and loue Hym euermar. 20

Iesu, þat me lif hath lent, into þi loue me brynge;  
 Tak to þe al myn entent, þat þou be my desyrynge.  
 Wo fro me away war went, and comyn my coueitynge,  
 If þat my soul had herd and hent þe songe of þi praysyng. 25

This loue is euer lestyng, ffor þat we may hit fele;  
 Therin me make brennyng, þat no þyng may me kele. 25  
 My þoght take in þi hand and stabil hit euery dele,  
 That I be nat holdyng to loue pis worldis wele.

Iff I loue an erthly þyng þat payeth to my wille,  
 And set my ioy and my likyng when hit may cum me tille, 30  
 I may me drede of depertyng, þat wil be hote and ille,  
 Ffor al my welth is bot wepyng when pyne my soul shal spille.

The ioy þat men hath sene is likened to þe haye,  
 That now is fair and grene, and now wityng away.  
 Such is pis world, I wene, and shal be to domys daye, 35  
 In trauaill and in tene, for fle no man hit may.

Iff þou loue in al þi þoght, and hate þe filth of syn,  
 [f. 32a] And gif þi hert Hym þat hit boght, þat He hit weld with wyn,  
 As þi soul Crist hath soght and perof wold nat blyn,  
 So þou shal to blisse be boght, and heuyn won within. 40

9 set: *C lyft, La liftid* 12 compileth: *C copuls, La couplip* 15 couereth: *C*  
 confortes, *La helip* 18 hit: *see p. 339 above* 19 wandryng: *C wandreth, La*  
 wandre pogh: *C if, La pou3* 20 with wyn: *see p. 339 above* 22 desyryng: *C*  
 3hernyng, *La 3erninge* 24 praysyng: *C louyng, La louyng* 26 may me:  
*C gar it, La may it* 31 hote: *C hate, La attir* 38 hert: *see p. 339 above*  
 hit . . . wyn: *see p. 339 above*

The kynd of loue þis is, ther hit is trusty and trewe,  
 To stond in stablenesse and chaunge for no newe.  
 The lif þat loue myght fynd, or euer in hert hit knewe,  
 Ffro kar turneth þat kynd, and led in myrth and glewe.

Forþi loue þou, I rede, Crist, as I þe telle.  
 With aungels take þi stede; þat ioy loke þou nat sylle.  
 In erthe þou hate no quede bot þat þi loue myght fele;  
 Ffor loue is stalwarth as dede, loue is hard as helle.

Love is a light birthyn, loue gladdeth yonge and olde;  
 Loue is withoutyn pyne, as louers hane me tolde;  
 Loue is a gostly wyne, þat maketh bigge and bolde;  
 Of loue no thyng shal tyne þat hit in hert wil holde.

Loue is þe swetest þyng þat man in erth hath tane;  
 Loue is Goddis derlyng, loue byndeth blode and bone.  
 In loue be our lyuyng, I wote no bettyr wone;  
 Ffor me and my louyng, loue maketh both be one.

Bot fleshely loue shal far as doth þe flour in Maye,  
 And lestyng be no mar than hit war bot a daye;  
 And soroweth sethen ful sar har prouthede and har playe,  
 When þei ben casten in car til pyne þat lesteth aye.

When erth and ayr shal bren, þan may þay quake and drede,  
 And vp shal rise al men to answar for har dede.  
 If þay ben seyn in syn, as now har lyf þai lede,  
 Þay shal sit hell within, and derkenesse haue to mede.

Rich men har hand shal wryng, and wicked werkes bye;  
 In flaume of fyr knyght and kyng with sorow and shame shal lye.  
 If þou wil loue, þan may þou synge to Crist in melodye;  
 The loue of Hym ouercometh al pyng, in loue lyve we and dye.

*Amen*

- 44 turneth: *C* it tornes, *La* it turnep led: *C* lendes, *La* such a mirþe fyndip to fewe  
 45 forþi: *C* for now, *La* for-þi 47 no quede bot: see p. 339 above fele:  
 for *C* felle 55 lyuyng: see p. 339 above 58 hit war bot: see p. 340 above  
 59 soroweth: *C* syghe, *La* sorewen har prouthede . . . playe: *C* þar lust, þar pryde,  
 þar play, *La* hir lust, her pride & al her play 61 when . . . pay: *C* when þair bodys  
 lyse in syn, þair sawls mai, *La* whanne her bodies in þe fen ligen, þanne schulen her  
 souls be in drede 62 and: *C* for, *La* and 63 seyn: *C* fonden, *La* seen  
 64 derkenesse: *C* myrknes, *La* derkenes 66 and shame shal lye: *C* schamfully, *La*  
 schamefastli 68 in . . . dye: see p. 340 above

Iesu, Goddis Son, Lord of Magesté,  
 Send wil into my hert only to couait þe;  
 Ref me likynge of þis world, my loue þat þou may be;  
 Take my hert into þi way, set me in stabilté.

Iesu, þe Maiden Son, þat with þi blode me boghte,  
 Thirle my soule with þi sper, þat loue in me hath wrought.  
 Me langeth led me to þi light and festyn in þe my thought;  
 [f.52b]In þi swetnesse fil my hert, my wo make wene to noht.

Iesu, my God, my Kynge, fforsake nat my desyr;  
 My thought make hit be meke, I haue bothe pride and ire.  
 Thi wil is my desyrynge, of loue kyndel þe fyr,  
 That I in swet louynge with angels tak my hyr.

Wownd my hert within, and weld hit at þi wille;  
 On blis þat neuer shal blyn þou make me fest my skylle.  
 That I þi loue may wyn, of grace my thought þou fille,  
 And make me clene of syn, þat I may cum þe tille.

Root hit in my hert, þe memorie of þy pyne;  
 In sekenes and in quert þi loue be euer myne.  
 My ioy is al of þe, my soule tak hit as Thyne;  
 My loue wixynge euer be, so þat hit neuer dwyne.

My songe is in sighynge, whils I dwel in þis waye;  
 My lif is in langynge, þat byndeth me nyght and daye  
 Til I cum to my Kynge, þat I won with Hym aye,  
 And se His fayr shynynge in lif þat lesteth aye.

Langynge is in me lent, for loue þat I ne can lete;  
 My loue hit hath me sent, þat euery bale may bete.  
 Sethen þat my hert was brent in Cristis loue so swete,  
 Al wo fro me is went, and we shal neuer mete.

I sit and synge of loue-langynge, þat in my brest is bredde;  
 Iesu, my Kynge and my Ioyng, why n' war I til þe ledde?  
 Fful wel I wote in al my state in ioy I shold be fedde;  
 Iesu me brynge into þi wonnynge, ffor blode þat þou shadde.

3 world: see p. 340 above  
 8 wene: C wane, La wexe  
 9 heryng, La desyrynge  
 23 aye: C may, La may  
 29 brest: see p. 341 above

4 way: C hand, La ward  
 10 haue: C hate, La hate  
 14 make: C gar, La þou fastne me þat y not spille  
 24 in lif: see p. 341 above  
 6 me: C men, La men  
 11 desyrynge: C  
 26 sent: C schent, La sent

Demed was to henge þe fair angels foode;  
 Fful sore þei kan Hym slynge, when þat He bounden stooode;  
 His bake was in betyng, and spild His blessed bloode;  
 The þorne crowned þe Kynge þat naked was on roode. 35

White was His naked breste, and reed His bloody syde;  
 Wan was His fair face, His woundes depe and wyde.  
 Þe Iues wold nat wand to pyne Hym þat tyde;  
 As stremes doth on strand, His blode can doune glide. 40

Blyndet war His fair eyen, His fleisshe bloody forbette;  
 His lousome lif was laid ful loth, and sorowfully vmset.  
 Deth and lyf bigan to stryve wheþer myght maistry mar,  
 When aungels bred was dampned to deth to saue our soules sar.

Lyf was slayn and risen anoon; in fairhed may we far;  
 And deth broght to litel or noon, and kasten in endles kar.  
 He þat þe boght haue al þi þoght and led þe in His lar;  
 Gif al þi hert to Crist, þi quert, and loue Hym euermar. 45

*Amen*

34 slynge: *C* swyng, *La* swing 36 naked: *C* nayled, *La* doon 40 on strand:  
*C* of þe strande, *La* see p. 338 above 41 war: *C* was, *La* were 43 (44 and 46)  
 deth: (*for northern form dede as C*) 45 anoon: *C* agayne, *La* a-ȝen 47 He  
 þat: *C* on Hym þat, *La* He þat

[f. 53a] I sigh and sob both day and nyght ffor on so fair of hewe.  
 Ther is no thyng my hert may light, bot loue þat euer is newe.  
 Who so had Hym in his syght, or in his hert Hym knewe,  
 His mournynge wer turned into bryght, his langynge into glewe.

In myrth he lyveth nyght and day, þat loueth þat swet Childe; 5  
 Hit is Iesu forsoth I say, of al mekest and mylde.  
 Wreth fro hym wil al away, þogh he war neuer so wyld,  
 That in hert Hym loued þat day, so stabil He is a childe.

Off Iesu þan moste list me speke, þat al my bale may bete.  
 Me thynte my hert wil al to breke when I þynke on þat swete. 10  
 In loue lacid He hath my thought, þat I shal neuer forelete;  
 Fful der me thynte He hath me boght with bloody hond and feete.

4 into bryght: *C* til ioi ful bryght, *La* into ioie bryȝt langynge: see p. 341 above  
 7 wil: *C* walde, *La* wolde 8 so . . . childe: *C* fra euel He wil hym schylde, *La*  
 from yuel He wole him schielde 10 wil: *C* may, *La* wole 11 forelete: see p. 341  
 above



For loue my hert boweth to brest when I þat fair biholde.  
 Loue is fair þer hit is feste, þat neuer wil be colde.  
 Loue vs reveth þe nyghtes reste, in grace hit maketh vs bolde,  
 Of al werkes loue is þe beste, as holy men vs tolde.

15

No wonder pegg I seghynge be, and seþen in sorow be sette;  
 Iesu was nayled vpon þe tre and al bloody forbette.  
 To þynke on Hym is grete pitté, how tendrely He grette;  
 This hath He suffred, man, for þe, if þat þou syn wil lette.

20

Thar is no loue in erth may tell of loue þe lest swetnesse.  
 That stidfastly in loue can dwell, his ioy is endles.  
 God shild þat he shold euer to hell, þat loueth and langynge is,  
 Or euer his enemys hym shold quell, or mak his lif be lasse.

Iesu is loue þat lesteth ay, to Hym is our langynge.  
 Iesu þe nyght turneth to day, þe ebynge into sprynge.  
 Iesu, þynke on vs nowe and ay, ffor þe we hold our Kynge.  
 Iesu, þou gif vs grace, as þou wel may, to loue without endynge.

25

*Amen*13 boweth: *C* es bowne, *La* wole to-berste16 vs: *C* me, *La* me

21 loue:

*C* tongue, *La* lijf24 lif: *C* luf, *La* or þat he so his loue schulde lese

26 eb-

bynge: *C* dawynge, *La* derknes

## WILLIAM CORNISH IN A PLAY, PAGEANTS, PRISON, AND POLITICS

By SYDNEY ANGLO

WILLIAM CORNISH, Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal from November 1509 till his death late in 1523, is the most considerable figure in the history of Early Tudor court revels. Poet, pageanteer, playwright, actor, singer, and composer, Cornish's importance has long been recognized. Yet there is still no satisfactory examination of his life, writings, and musical compositions.<sup>1</sup> The following notes are not intended to do more than fill in one or two gaps in our knowledge of Cornish's career and to draw attention to three sources that have been overlooked in this connexion.

The first source is the manuscript chronicle of London, now preserved in the Guildhall Library, which 'may be fitly described as *The Great Chronicle*'.<sup>2</sup> This designation, first suggested by Kingsford, was adopted when the work was prepared for publication and is an apt description of the fullest of all London chronicles. The huge compilation, which has been conclusively established as the work of Robert Fabian, has been accessible in print since 1938 though few scholars appear to have drawn upon the wealth of information contained in it.<sup>3</sup> It has three references to Cornish which shed light upon his activities in 1494 and 1508 and upon the story of his imprisonment in 1504. The second source is the account books of John Heron, Treasurer of the Chamber, from the eleventh to eighteenth years of Henry VII's reign.<sup>4</sup> These volumes, now preserved at the Public Record

<sup>1</sup> C. W. Wallace, *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare* (Berlin, 1912), which scarcely touches upon Cornish's music and which is marred by its curious conclusions, remains the only detailed account of Cornish's career. *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 5th edn. (London, 1954), has a short article under *Cornyshe* with references concerning the location of the manuscripts of Cornish's music. Rather more useful is the article under *Cornyshe* in Jeffrey Pulver, *A Biographical Dictionary of Old English Music* (London, 1927).

<sup>2</sup> C. L. Kingsford, *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913), p. 77.

<sup>3</sup> A. H. Thomas and I. D. Thornley, *The Great Chronicle of London* (London, 1938). Fabian's work is discussed in the copious introduction.

<sup>4</sup> Public Record Office, *Miscellaneous Accounts of the Exchequer* (E.101/414/6; E. 101/414/16; E.101/415/3). I have made a complete collection of the payments, in these volumes, relating to entertainments, plays, and disguisings, which throw considerable light upon court festivities under Henry VII. Historians dealing with court entertainments of this period usually refer, for household payments, to British Museum Additional MS. 7099; but this is merely a collection of haphazard extracts from Heron's accounts between 1491 and 1505 made by Craven Orde. These extracts are useful because the original accounts

Office, include payments of rewards to Cornish in 1496 and 1500 and demonstrate that he was intimately concerned with the court entertainments given to celebrate the marriage of Prince Arthur and Katharine of Aragon in November 1501. The last source is a letter written by Salinas, Ambassador of the Archduke Ferdinand at the Imperial Court, who accompanied the Emperor Charles V on his visit to England in the summer of 1522. This letter has been published in the original Spanish and in an English translation. It describes Cornish's political play, performed at Windsor on 15 June, and considerably amplifies the well-known account given by the chronicler Edward Hall.<sup>1</sup>

*Cornish as Saint George: Epiphany 1494*

That nyght in Westminster halle was a great bankett . . . where theyre was a playe, with a pageant of St. george with a castle, and also xij lordes knights and Esquyers with xij ladies dysguysed which dyd daunce.<sup>2</sup>

This short description of the revels for Twelfth Night 1494 has long been a stand-by for historians writing of Henry VII's court festivals for, apart from the descriptions of the marriage celebrations of Prince Arthur in 1501, there has been no detailed account of such an entertainment in this period.<sup>3</sup> However, *The Great Chronicle* reports this festivity at length and reveals that already, a few months after the first references to his appearance at court, Cornish was taking a leading part in royal entertainments.<sup>4</sup>

In the White Hall at Westminster the Mayor and his brethren were

prior to October 1495 are missing, but they are in no way complete with regard to court entertainments. Wallace, *Evolution*, p. 27 n. 7, made a great show of thoroughness by eschewing the random extracts from Add. MS. 7099 printed in S. Bentley, *Excerpta Historica* (London, 1833), but failed to realize that Orde's work itself consisted of extracts. Wallace treated the manuscript as though it were a complete copy of the original accounts—thus missing the references to Cornish in the books at the P.R.O. Collier, *The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of Shakespeare* (London, 1879), i. 50–54, prints extracts relating to players and must have had access not only to Add. 7099 but also to Heron's original books, for he gives several payments, including one to Cornish, not in Orde's manuscript. Wallace was, however, correct in pointing out that Collier sometimes misdated his references and was inexact.

<sup>1</sup> *El Emperador Carlos V y su Corte según las Cartas de Don Martín de Salinas Embajador del Infante Don Fernando (1522–1539)*, ed. Antonio Rodríguez Villa (Madrid, 1903), pp. 40–41. This letter is fully calendared in the *Calendar of State Papers (Spanish)*, ii, no. 437.

<sup>2</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 6113, f. 169<sup>a</sup>. Cf. C. L. Kingsford, *Chronicles of London* (Oxford, 1905), p. 200, from B.M. Cotton MS. Vitellius B.xvi, f. 148<sup>b</sup>, which is even shorter and does not mention either St. George or the castle.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Reyher, *Les Masques Anglais* (Paris and London, 1909), p. 6 n. 3, where the reference is wrongly given as B.M. Harleian MS. 6113. Cf. Robert Withington, *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline* (Cambridge, Mass., 1918), i. 112; Enid Welsford, *The Court Masque* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> *The Great Chronicle*, pp. 251–2. The earliest references to Cornish at court are two payments made late in 1493; one is a reward of 13s. 4d. for a *prophecy*; the other is of 100s. the reason for which is not stated. See Wallace, p. 33 n. 4, and p. 34 n. 1.

entertained to dinner, after which they were escorted into the King's chamber. The Mayor was dubbed a knight and was 'desyrid by the lord styward as by the kyngys Commaundement to tary & see such dysportys as that nygth shuld be shewid'. The hall appointed for the show was hung with arras and had been staged along the sides so that the spectators might have a good view of the performance. At about 11 p.m. the King came into the hall accompanied by the ambassadors from France and Spain and with the Queen and her ladies. When all were comfortably settled the King's players entered and 'shewid a goodly Interlude'; but before they could finish their play there was a dramatic interruption.

Cam In Ridyng oon of the kyngys Chapell namyd Cornysh apparaylid aftyr the ffygure of Seynt George, and aftir ffolowid a ffayer vyrgyn attyrid lyke unto a kyngys dowgthyr, and ledyng by a sylkyn lace a Terryble & huge Rede dragun, The which In Sundry placys of the halle as he passyd spytt ffyre at hys mowth And when the said Cornysh was cummyn before the kyng he uttyrd a certain spech made In balad Royall, aftyr ffynysshyng whereof he began This antemprn off Seynt George, *O Georgi deo Care*, whereunto the kyngys Chapell which stood ffast (by) answerid *Salvatorem Deprecare, ut Gubernat Angliam*, And soo sang owth alle the hool antemprn wyth lusty Corage, In passe tyme whereof The said Cornysh avoydid wyth the dragon, and the vyrgyn was ladd unto the Quenys standyng.

This, apart from the inexplicit payments of 1493, seems to be the first reference to Cornish in court entertainments and shows him, even at this early date, in the roles of actor and singer and, possibly, author and composer. He took no further part in the revelling that evening but the description, in *The Great Chronicle*, of the disguising and dance also deserves to be better known for it gives some idea of the nature of the Christmas festivities that figure so prominently in the Household account books for Henry VII's reign. Moreover, the account of the dance, though brief and rather ambiguous, suggests a degree of complexity in the choreography that would not otherwise be divined from other descriptions of English court entertainments of the early Tudor period.

There entered twelve gentlemen leading twelve ladies 'by kerchyffys of plesance'. Both parties were disguised and were led by a 'small Tabret & a subtyl ffeydyl'. These gentlemen leapt and danced the length of the hall while the ladies

slode aftyr theym as they hadd standyn upon a frame Runnyng, with whelys, They kept theyr Tracis soo demwyr & cloos that theyr lymmys movid all at oonys.

When they came before the King they removed their visors and performed a series of dances that lasted over an hour.

All whych seson It was wondyrfful to behold the excedyng lepyz Ganbawdys & turnyngys above ground which the Gentylnen made that theyr spangyls of goold & othyr of theyr Garnysshys fyll ffrom theym Rygth habundantly, But Eyvmore the ladyes kept theyr ffyrst maner soo demuyrly as they hadd been Imagis, how well that soom of theym cowde speke quyk & delyver Inglysh yf they were fferre attemptid (as soom of theym were there then Reportid).

After the dances the disguisers left the hall, though the men later reappeared, still in disguising apparel, bearing dishes for the King's feast which ended the festivities. The King and Queen were conveyed into the palace 'wyth a grete sort of lygthis', and the Mayor and aldermen returned home by river.

*Cornish and Prince Arthur's Marriage: November 1501*

In November 1501, after years of negotiation, Henry VII gained a diplomatic triumph when Katharine of Aragon came to London to celebrate her marriage with Arthur, Prince of Wales. Katharine's entry into London was signalized by the most elaborate pageant series that had yet been given in England, while at court the occasion was marked by similarly outstanding entertainments of a brilliance far exceeding all that had ever preceded them. There survives a description of these entertainments written by a herald who appears to rely upon eyewitness evidence and who gives particulars of the banquets, disguisings, dances, and scenic effects.<sup>1</sup>

A draft series of ordinances relating to the wedding preparations includes the information that Jaques Hault and William Pawne were appointed to 'devise and prepare disguisings and some morisques after the best manner they can'.<sup>2</sup> The names of Hault and Pawne occur frequently in the household accounts of Henry VII, the latter mainly being concerned with repair work on the highways, the former regularly concerned with the Christmas disguisings at court but even more often in connexion with building work at Woodstock and elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Pawne was probably acting in a general administrative capacity with Hault who may, in addition, have been in charge of the construction of the pageant scenery used for the disguisings. But the main disbursement of money was in the hands of a John

<sup>1</sup> Francis Grose and Thomas Astle, *The Antiquarian Repertory* (London, 1808), ii. 296-319. This is a rather superior version to that printed in Leland's *Collectanea* (London, 1774), v. 356-73, and gives the descriptions and verses for the pageants shown in London.

<sup>2</sup> B.M. Harl. MS. 69, f. 43<sup>b</sup>, printed in Hardewicke, *Miscellaneous State Papers* (London, 1778), i. 19. The original draft by Henry VII's Council is in Cotton MS. Vespasian C xiv, f. 81, and has been printed in Gairdner, *Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII* (London, 1861), i. 404-19, but it does not include the item relating to Hault and Pawne.

<sup>3</sup> In August and September 1497, in addition to several payments for 'belding at Wodstok', Hault also received £30 'for the tenes play'—probably for preparing the tennis courts (P.R.O., E.101/414/6, under 30 August and 10-12 September).

Atkinson who, between 16 July and 29 October 1501, received over £300 for silks and other necessities for the disguisings.<sup>1</sup>

In the week following the marriage ceremony the King entertained his distinguished guests to four great banquets each of which was enlivened by a disguising and dance—the disguisers in each case making their entry on elaborate pageant cars. Three of these entertainments were non-dramatic. On Sunday, 21 November, there were two pageants; one like an arbour, containing the disguised lords; the other made like a transparent lantern, holding the ladies. On Thursday the 25th the lords and ladies, playing on divers musical instruments, entered separately on pageant cars like mounts—one fertile with greenery, the other scorched and studded with minerals. On Sunday the 28th there was only one pageant which was like a tabernacle drawn by sea-horses and children of the Chapel Royal dressed as mermaids who sang 'right swetly and with great armory'.<sup>2</sup> These disguisings and pageants had no dramatic element but were simply elaborately staged dances. On each occasion the men danced by themselves before being joined by the ladies, while on 21 November the ladies also danced alone. These carefully distinguished performances suggest that, in addition to the usual combined dances, there may have been an incipient ballet—an idea strengthened by the seeming complexity of the 1494 choreography.<sup>3</sup>

However, on Friday, 19 November, there had been given the first of this series of disguisings and it was very different in character from those that followed. It consisted of three pageants: the first, bearing eight disguised

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., E.101/415/3.

16 July.	Item deliuered to John atkinson for silkes to be bought for the disguysing	x <sup>11</sup>
23 July.	Item to John atkinson in full payment of his Rekenynges for the disguysinges	xxxiiij <sup>11</sup> xvijs <sup>11</sup> iiij <sup>d</sup>
31 July.	Item to John atkinson opon his boke	xxiiij <sup>11</sup> x <sup>s</sup> viij <sup>d</sup>
18 August.	Item to John atkinson apon a prest	x <sup>11</sup>
23 August.	Item to John atkinson for an other disguysing	xx <sup>11</sup>
20 Septemb.	Item to John atkinson in full payment of his Rekenyng vnto this day	lxxix <sup>11</sup> ix <sup>s</sup> viij <sup>d</sup>
5 October.	Item deliuered to John atkinson by bille	lxxiiij <sup>11</sup> vjs <sup>11</sup> viij <sup>d</sup>
29 October.	Item deliuered to John atkinson apon a bille for the disguysinges	liij <sup>11</sup> iijs <sup>11</sup> x <sup>d</sup>

Under 30 June there is a payment of £20 to Atkinson 'for certain stuff to be bought for Jakes haulte'.

<sup>2</sup> Wallace, pp. 13, 26, 29, asserts that the first time the Children of the Chapel appeared in a Christmas show was in 1490 when they acted as mermaids, and he cites (p. 13 n. 1) Harl. MS. 69, f. 34<sup>b</sup>. But this unquestionably refers to the entertainment of Sunday, 28 November 1501.

<sup>3</sup> Concerning the dances, there are some differences between the versions in the *Antiq. Rep.* and in Leland's *Collectanea*. The former gives the impression that on the 21st the men and women, after dancing separately, may not have coupled; the latter specifically says that they did. The former says that on the 25th the lords and ladies coupled without dancing separately, while the latter says that the men first danced alone.

ladies, was a castle the four towers of which each contained a child singing sweetly; the second was a fully rigged ship whose master and men in their 'countenauns, spechis, and demeanor usid and behavyd them self after the manner and guyse of marynours'. When the ship had cast anchor, *Hope* and *Desire*, ambassadors from certain *Knights of the Mount of Love*, passed to the castle and tried to gain the favour of the ladies, who refused their advances. The ambassadors, in anger, warned the ladies that the knights would make such an assault on the castle that it would be 'grevous to abyde there power and malesse'. Thereupon the knights themselves entered on a third pageant which was like a mountain. The ambassadors reported the ladies' refusal, whereupon the knights hastened to the attack and soon compelled the ladies to surrender, descend from their stronghold, and join them in goodly dances.

This first disguising, with its combination of singing, dramatic dialogue, assault upon a castle, and final dance, is of a twofold significance: it represents something new in English court entertainments; and it foreshadows the series of similar revels that filled the early years of Henry VIII's reign. In the production of the latter series the name of William Cornish is predominant. It can now be established, from the accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, that Cornish was actively concerned with the entertainments of November 1501, for on 6 August, 22 August, and 8 September there are three payments, each of £10, for his 'disguysing'. There is also a payment of £10 to 'Cornyshe for his pagent' on 20 September; while on 3 November there is a final payment of £20 to 'Cornyshe for his iij pagenttes'.<sup>1</sup> The only other payments for disguisings are those to Atkinson, although John

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., E. 101/415/3. Collier, *History*, p. 49, cites the reference to Cornish's three pageants but, misdating it under the year 1502, fails to connect it with the marriage festivities of Prince Arthur. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), ii. 29-30 (p. 29 n. 6), mentions the payment to Cornish for three pageants; presumably he takes the information from Collier but dates the reference 26 October 1501 and recognizes that it refers to the marriage celebrations. However, he suggests that the available data on Cornish yield an older William and a John Cornish and inexplicably postulates that the latter was probably responsible for the 1501 show. I can see no reason at all for such a view and, in any case, Heron's account book proves, beyond dispute, that William Cornish was indicated since the payment under 22 August specifically states 'Item to william Cornyshe for disguysing . . . x<sup>li</sup>'.

Denis Stevens, 'Théâtre et "Pageants" à l'Époque des Tudors' in *Les Fêtes de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1956), pp. 260-1, writes that William Newark, Master of the Chapel Royal, was responsible for the 1501 entertainments and that Cornish was one of his assistants. Unfortunately he cites no evidence for such a statement, which is refuted by the payments in Heron's account books. Furthermore, there is no direct evidence that Newark was ever connected with the preparation of dramatic entertainments at court, although it is possible that, in his capacity of Master of the Chapel, he may have been concerned with the music and songs for such shows. But as far as the disguisings and pageants of 1501 are concerned there is clear proof that the most important were the work of Cornish and that the others were prepared mainly by Atkinson.



English, one of the King's players, received payment for a pageant.<sup>1</sup> The last three disguisings were non-dramatic and were probably those prepared by Atkinson, perhaps in collaboration with English; but the first was exactly the type of show that Cornish prepared later in his career, while he had already made his dramatic début at court in 1494. Furthermore, only the first disguising had three related pageants—the castle, ship, and mount—almost certainly Cornish's 'iij pagenttes'. Thus it seems clear that Cornish, already accepted by scholars as pre-eminent in Henry VIII's revels, must assume an even greater importance through his connexion with the marriage festivities of Prince Arthur, and especially through his almost certain authorship of the disguising of 19 November—the most significant of all early Tudor court entertainments.

### *Cornish, Empson, and John Stow*

There is preserved among the Royal Manuscripts in the British Museum a poem entitled *A Treatise bitwene Trowth and enformacion* which also exists, imperfectly, in the Harleian collection.<sup>2</sup> The work is headed as follows:

In the Fleete made be me William Cornysse otherwyse called Nysshewhete, chapelman with the moost famost kyng Henry the vij<sup>th</sup>, his raigne the xix<sup>th</sup> yere, the moneth of July, a Treatise biwtene Trowth and enformacion.

This clearly implies that the author, Cornish, was in the Fleet prison during the summer of 1504. The reason for his imprisonment is not stated in the poem, but modern biographers invariably cite as the cause a satire by Cornish against Sir Richard Empson, Henry VII's unpopular extortioner. Indeed Squire, in his article on Cornish in *D.N.B.*, hazarded that the rubric *A.B. of E. how C. for T. was p. in p.*, which follows the title of the

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., E. 101/415/3.

31 August. Item to John atkinson for John Englishe. . . . . vij<sup>ll</sup>

8 Sept. Item for John English pagient. . . . . vij<sup>ll</sup> xij<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup>

3 November. Item to John English for his pagent . . . . . vij<sup>ll</sup> xij<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Royal MS. 18. D II, f. 163<sup>a</sup>–164<sup>a</sup>. Harl. MS. 43, ff. 88<sup>a</sup>–91<sup>a</sup>. The poem is described in the *Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts* (i, p. 12) as 'A treatyse bytwene Enformacione & Musyke: Or rather, an imperfect Ballade, with a Prologue which is Mangled, and the Authors name Cutt out: He seems to have been a Lollard, and not unskilful of Music, as then Practised.' Immediately following the *Treatise*, in Harl. 43, at f. 92, is a *balade of trouthe*, in rhyme royal, which continues on a similar theme; for example, in the sixth verse:

Trouthe many tymys ys cast  
out of credens / by enformacyon  
yet trouthe crepthe out at last  
and ovyr mastrythe cavylacyon.

F. J. Furnivall printed the Harleian text of the *Treatise*, collated with the Royal text, in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, cxx (1908), 421–6.

*Treatise*, indicated 'A Ballad of Empson, how Cornish for Treason was Put in Prison'. Chambers, taking the idea a stage farther, thought that the *Treatise* itself was 'doubtless the satirical ballad on Empson referred to by Stow'.<sup>1</sup>

John Stow it is who supplied the basis for these notions—though he did so unwittingly, for his version certainly does not imply the ideas that have been inferred from it. Stow, writing of the measures taken at the beginning of Henry VIII's reign to regulate the kingdom, says that a few people were excluded from the general pardons and were arrested and put into the Tower and other prisons. He continues:

In the which time, many approbrious rimes in despite of them were made, wherof I haue seene some, especially one against Sir Richard Empson, made by Cornish of the kings Chappell, at the request of the Earle of Kent, forasmuch, as the said Empson had deceived him of a part of his Land, and in sinister waies had so informed the king of him, that hee was long holden vnder, and put to great hinderance.<sup>2</sup>

In other words, the ballad against Empson was written after the accession of Henry VIII, so that the author could scarcely have been imprisoned for it in 1504. Nor does the passage make any mention of Cornish's imprisonment. Stow simply says that Cornish had written the poem for the Earl of Kent, that the latter had suffered from Empson's exactions, and that Stow himself had seen this particular poem. From this straightforward account have been drawn the curious stories representing Cornish as a martyr who suffered for his opposition to Empson's extortion.

The *Treatise* itself, written in seven-line stanzas of rhyme royal, consists of four introductory verses which complain how a man might be convicted by 'false enformacion', followed by sixteen verses of *A parable betwene enformacion and musike* which argue, by musical metaphors, that the author had been wrongfully accused. There is nothing to suggest that the work had anything to do with Empson and the troublesome rubric must mean a *Ballad of Enformacion*, and possibly *how Cornish for Trowth was put in prison*. It has been suggested that the poem may have been written for Cornish by Skelton, in whose *Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes* it was printed in 1568.<sup>3</sup> But there seems no reason at all, considering Cornish's

<sup>1</sup> *Stage*, ii. 29. Before Squire's article in *D.N.B.*, literary historians seem not to have connected Cornish's imprisonment with the writing of a satire on Empson. Collier, i. 47, notes Cornish's *Treatise* and the passage in Stow, but does not connect the two; William Chappell, 'Some account of an Unpublished Collection of King Henry VIII and his Contemporaries', *Archaeologia*, xli (1867), 380, also reads Stow accurately.

<sup>2</sup> *Annales* (London, 1631), p. 487.

<sup>3</sup> This suggestion is made in the *Catalogue of Royal and King's Manuscripts in the British Museum. The Pithy pleasaunt and profitable workes of maister Skelton, Poete Laureate, Nowe collected and newly published ANNO 1568*, has a table of contents headed 'Workes of Skel-

noted activities as a poet and composer, why he should not or could not have written the *Treatise* himself. Certainly the musical metaphors are to be expected of a member of the King's Chapel, while Cornish, some of whose song settings yet survive, could well have written the lines:

Musike in his melody requirith true soundes  
 who settith a songe shulde geve hym to armony  
 who kepith treue his tunys may not passe his boundes  
 his alteracions and prolacions must be prikked trewly  
 ffor musike is treue tho mynstralles makith maistry  
 The harper carith nothings but rewarde for his songe  
 merely soundith his mouth when his tonge goth all wronge.<sup>1</sup>

And some unfortunate practical experience could have induced him to write:

he that hath spite at another mannys songe  
 will do what he can to haue it songe wronge.<sup>2</sup>

In *The Great Chronicle* there is a long section, devoted to the attack on Empson, which was the basis for Stow's famous account. Stow was actually in possession of the manuscript of the chronicle, possibly even before 1576,<sup>3</sup> and in the section under discussion quotes much of *The Great Chronicle* verbatim, giving as his authority Robert Fabian whom he recog-

ton newly collected by I.S.' in which the thirty-first poem is given as 'A parable by William Cornish in the fleete'. Alexander Dyce, *The Poetical Works of John Skelton* (London, 1843), discusses this volume at pp. cxvii-cxviii where he writes: 'How the very dull poem (31) by William Cornishe came to be inserted in this collection, I know not; but I may just observe that it is to be found (with a better text) in MS. Reg. 18. D. ii, where it immediately precedes Skelton's verses on the Death of the Earl of Northumberland'. Music historians have naturally seized upon this poem for its many interesting references to instruments and musical performance and I must thank my friend Eric Halfpenny, Secretary of the Galpin Society, for drawing my attention to the following two sources. Sir John Hawkins, *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music* (London, 1776), ii. 507-12, discusses Cornish very briefly and prints the sixteen verses of the *Parable*; and at pp. 180-1 discusses the verse on the four colours in music and mentions that the poem was printed at the end of Skelton's works. Edward Rimbault, *The Pianoforte, its Origin, Progress, and Construction* (London, 1860), pp. 44-45, cites two verses from the *Parable* and in a note on p. 44 he writes: 'This curious poem, in black letter, was printed by Wynkin de Worde.' Unfortunately Rimbault's statement is not supported by any reference and such a volume is not mentioned in the section on Wynkyn de Worde by E. G. Duff in the *Hand-Lists of Books Printed by London Printers 1501-1556* (Bibliographical Society, 1895-1913). Nor is the volume included in the extensive hand-list of Wynkyn de Worde's publications compiled by H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1475-1547* (Cambridge, 1952), despite the fact that the list accepts attributions made by 'earlier biographers, cataloguers and others, although it is not always possible to check their statements'.

These various printed versions differ from each other and from both manuscript versions.

<sup>1</sup> Royal MS. 18. D II, f. 163<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> *The Great Chronicle*, introd. p. xvi.

nized as the compiler of the work.<sup>1</sup> There is, however, one difference. Whereas Stow merely mentions the genre of opprobrious rhymes against those exempted from the general pardons at the beginning of Henry VIII's reign, *The Great Chronicle* actually gives an example—this is, in fact, the poem that Stow claims to have seen. The poem consists of twenty seven-line stanzas in rhyme royal abusing Empson in a very crude fashion typified by the first verse:

O myschevous M, ffyrst syllable of thy name  
Sone to the devyll, ffor the second part  
As alexander In honour, soo thow In shame  
May be Remembrid, that moost wrecchid art  
A cancrid knave, a churle of the cart  
Of venymous blood, of hygth presumption  
A bond churle born, In Towcetyr town.<sup>2</sup>

At the conclusion of the ballad *The Great Chronicle* continues:

The maker of this Balad or cawser thereof was Therle of kent ffor soo much as the sayd Empson had dyssayvid hym of a part of hys land, and In Synystir wayes had soo enfourmyd the kyngis grace of hym that he was long holdyn undyr and put to grete hynderaunce and punyshment, wherffor he In his dyspyte & shame cawsid this to be made of hym.<sup>3</sup>

This, it will be seen, is virtually the same as the account given by Stow, who merely adds the information that the poem was written for the Earl of Kent by Cornish. This information is not in the original manuscript of *The Great Chronicle* but, between the words 'The maker of this Balad' and 'or cawser thereof', have been added, in Stow's hand, the words 'was Cornyshe of the k. chapell & the'.<sup>4</sup> Stow must have felt very certain of the reliability of this information to have inserted it into a narrative which, in other particulars, he was content to follow.

Stow's source has not been discovered, but the idea of Cornish's authorship (notwithstanding Stow's certainty) cannot be accepted without reservations. This part of *The Great Chronicle* is roughly contemporary with the events it describes, so that the author of the ballad, if known, might well have been mentioned. What makes this more likely is the existence, later in the chronicle, of evidence that Cornish was well known as a poet fit to rank with his contemporaries Skelton and More or with the great Chaucer himself. This evidence is found in another scurrilous poem—this time

<sup>1</sup> *The Great Chronicle*, pp. xli-xliii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 334.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 347.

<sup>4</sup> This fact is noted by the editors of *The Great Chronicle*.

directed against John Baptist Grimald, one of Empson's henchmen<sup>1</sup>—where this verse is included:

O most cursid Caytyff, what shuld I of the wryte  
Or telle the particulers, of thy cursid lyffe  
I trow If Skelton, or Cornysh wold endyte  
Or mastyr moor, they mygth not Inglysh Ryffe  
Nor yit Chawcers, If he were now In lyffe  
Cowde not In metyr, half thy shame spelle  
Nor yit thy ffalshod, half declare or telle.<sup>2</sup>

But it would be a pity, writes the poet, if such famous authors should spend their time 'abowth soo vyle a thyng'. Thus the compiler of *The Great Chronicle* would have known of Cornish both from the 1494 entertainment and from the reference in the poem against Grimald, so that, had Cornish been well known as the author of the attack on Empson, the compiler could be expected to have recorded the information.<sup>3</sup> Thus it is still not possible to trace beyond Stow the source for the story that the poem in *The Great Chronicle* is by Cornish or, more important, that there ever was a poem against Empson by Cornish.<sup>4</sup>

#### *Cornish's Political Play: 15 June 1522*

Late in May 1522 the Emperor Charles V crossed the Channel to visit his loving uncle Henry VIII and to cement the Imperial alliance with

<sup>1</sup> The poem against Empson includes a verse attacking Grimald:

Promoters & prollers, thow haddyst many oon  
Which alle to name, wold axe a long space  
But yit of alle, he may be sett aloon  
That churlysh knave, wyth his blobby fface  
Of alle most ffalset, & moost devoyd of Grace  
John Grumbald theeff, and worst of alle men  
Deservid to be hanged, more than x tymys ten. (p. 345)

<sup>2</sup> *The Great Chronicle*, p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> A more likely author is the perpetrator of the Grimald verses, also in rhyme royal, who names himself (p. 365) as 'Tom a dale' who lives at the windmill 'at Aylysbury, there down In the vale'.

<sup>4</sup> It is odd that, in view of Stow's dependence upon *The Great Chronicle*, the editors should think the poem is interesting as corroboration for the story that Empson was the son of a sieve-maker. As far as I can see the most important promulgator of this story was Stow who, prefacing his remarks with the parenthesis 'sayeth mine Author', repeats a large part of *The Great Chronicle* which laments the dangers caused by men who suddenly rise from lowly positions to power. Stow, writing of Empson, says 'especially such as this man was, the which suddenly rose from poverty (as being the Sonne of a Sieve-maker, in Tocester) vnto inestimable authority and riches' (*Annales*, p. 487). This, except for the parenthesis, is virtually identical with the corresponding section of *The Great Chronicle*; and the parenthesis itself must have been drawn from the poem, which Stow does not otherwise quote, where there is a reference to Empson's forgetting his 'ffadyr, which made, whylom the Syvys Round' (p. 344).

England against France. Henry's relations with Francis I were becoming increasingly strained through maritime disputes and the failure of France to pay the pensions required for Tournai, while the success attending the Emperor's arms in Italy during the spring must have removed any doubts there may have been in Henry's mind concerning an alliance with Charles.<sup>1</sup> The climax of the Imperial visit was the arrangement of the articles of alliance at Windsor on 16 June;<sup>2</sup> but on the previous evening the princes and the leading personages of their retinues were entertained with a play which represented a crude but accurate summary of the negotiations that had taken place during the Emperor's stay and their expected results. The author of the work was William Cornish, as can be established from the payments in Gibson's *Revels Accounts*,<sup>3</sup> and it was probably the last of his important court entertainments, for he died late in the following year.<sup>4</sup> Martin de Salinas, Ambassador of the Archduke Ferdinand at the Imperial Court, included a description of the play in a letter written on 21 June 1522, and it is from this that the following account is drawn.<sup>5</sup>

The first actor to appear on the stage declared that he was *Friendship* and that he had performed many great and noble deeds in the time of the Romans and afterwards. Then *Prudence* entered and was received, with many demonstrations of joy, by *Friendship* who said that he had been seeking for *Prudence* and that both, if united, could perform very great feats. They accordingly concluded an alliance, during which time *Might* entered and was well received by the other two characters who declared that they needed no other ally, apart from him, in order to execute their plans. *Friendship* was to make certain that no discord broke out between them; *Prudence* would counsel; and *Might* would carry out their measures. Thus there was nothing in the world that they could not accomplish. A note of absurdity now enters into the fragmentary accounts that survive of

<sup>1</sup> *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. Brewer, III. ii, nos. 2076, 2139, 2292.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, nos. 2322, 2333; *Cal. S.P. Spanish*, ii, nos. 427, 430.

<sup>3</sup> That Cornish was the author of this political play appears from the general heading given in Gibson's *Revels Accounts* for 4, 5, and 16 June, P.R.O., S.P.1/24, f. 233<sup>b</sup>, 'now in sewe the revells of master wylliam kornyche with the kosts to hym delivered by the kynges cmmmandment all sech stuf'; from the payment for carriage of Cornish's materials to Windsor at f. 232<sup>a</sup>, 'Item payd for a karte to wyndsor and for hyr a boot ther for the karryage of the meskeler stuf and master kornyches devyssys for revells'; and from more specific references linking Cornish's name with the outlay for ferroures' doublets, hunters' jackets, and a keeper's hose: see p. 359 n. 1 below.

<sup>4</sup> See Wallace, pp. 60-61.

<sup>5</sup> *Cal. S.P. Spanish*, ii, no. 437, Martin de Salinas to the Treasurer Salamanca, 21 June 1522. Cf. Hall, *Chronicles* (ed. 1809), 641: 'And on Sunday at night in the great halle was a disguisynge play, theeffect of it was that there was a proud horse which would not be tamed nor bridled, but amitie sent prudence and pollicie which tamed him, and force & puissance bridled him.'



this performance; it seems that the sole task which absorbed the interests of this all-powerful trio was the taming of wild horses, for they made the proud boast, apropos of nothing, that any horse would soon be made to obey them, no matter how wild and unruly he might be. Now entered workmen with anvil and hammers. These, evidently, were the 'ferroures' (workers in iron, or smiths) referred to in the *Revels Accounts* for this entertainment and for whom there were provided two doublets of crimson satin.<sup>1</sup> Salinas does not say what part these blacksmiths played in the story but they must have been connected, in some way, with the horse-taming scene that followed. A man now came on to the stage with a great horse that was very wild and ferocious. The mighty trio asked the man what it was that he desired. He replied that the horse belonged to him but that it was so wild and untameable that he could make no use of it. *Friendship* then assured the man that he had met just the right people for they best knew how to manage an unruly horse. If he would confide the animal to them they would not only subdue him but also make him as tame and obedient as any horse in the world. Nor were they unworthy of their word and, in a trice it would seem, they made a bridle and fitted it to the horse. That accomplished they asked the man to mount the beast. At first the owner refused, fearing the animal to be recalcitrant, but when at length he was prevailed upon to mount he found the erstwhile terror quiet and obedient. Yet still the proud creature raised his head very high—an action that irritated *Friendship* who claimed that he would make him lower his head. A curb was attached to the beast's head which was immediately lowered. So complete was the subjection of the horse that it followed its master wherever he went. And so the farce ended. There followed an entry of maskers, both men and women, who danced the *pabana* and so worked up an appetite for the 'costly banket and a voidy of spices' which completed the evening's revelry.<sup>2</sup>

Nobody could accuse Cornish, the deviser of the play, of excessive subtlety. The Spaniard, to whom we are indebted for such details of the

<sup>1</sup> P.R.O., S.P.1/24, ff. 229<sup>b</sup>–35<sup>b</sup>, includes several payments relating to this particular entertainment.

- f. 233<sup>b</sup>, payment for doublets for the ferroures.  
payment for green sarsenet for three 'fosters kootes and hoods'.
- f. 234<sup>a</sup>, 13 yards of fine kendall for 'iiij hunters yacketes'.  
12 yards of 'checkyrd kentall . . . for the kepers hossyn'.
- f. 234<sup>b</sup>, 240 ells of canvas from the King's Store for 'wodwos koots and garments and  
for the keveryng of pagent and a stuffyd body and keveryng of the pagent  
over thuart the hall and seche lykke'.

Not all these characters make an appearance in the play as described by Salinas, but they seem to suit the horsey nature of the show.

<sup>2</sup> Hall writes that there was a sumptuous masque of twelve men and twelve women; Salinas writes that there were eight men and eight women.



performance as survive, pointed out that its meaning was clear—the horse was the King of France. Hall, after his very brief account, writes:

This horse was ment by the Frenche kyng, & amitie by the king of England & themperor, & the other prisoners were their counsaill and power.<sup>1</sup>

It is not clear whether there was any particular logic behind the representation of the French King by a horse. The classical story which, if the deviser were bent upon taming horses, should have come to mind was that of Castor who was famed for his ability in managing horses; but there was no such allusion in this play. The most likely explanation is that the horse was being used, on this occasion, to signify war<sup>2</sup> and was thus equated with the King of France who, from the viewpoint of Henry and Charles, would be an aggressor; but this interpretation is not discussed in the Spaniard's narration and cannot be asserted categorically. Still, Cornish had done his best, however curious the result; and the performance brought his long career in court festivals near to its end amidst the blaze of Anglo-Imperial friendship when the English court was, for the moment, the very centre of European politics.

<sup>1</sup> The 'prisoners' in Hall's text make little sense and I take the word to be an error for *persons* arrived at through the misinterpretation of a *per* abbreviation for a *pri*.

<sup>2</sup> Piero Valeriano Bolzani, *Hieroglyphica sive de sacris Aegyptiorum literis commentarii* (Basle, 1556), f. 31<sup>a</sup>, gives, as the first symbolic meaning of the horse, the notion of war and cites as authority a passage from Virgil's *Aeneid*. The *Hieroglyphica* was, of course, too late to have influenced the play of 1522; but such an interpretation of the horse, drawn from the relevant passage in the *Aeneid* (iii. 535-43), could well have been known in England. It relates to the appearance of four snow-white steeds as the first omen to greet the voyagers in Sicily. Anchises exclaims that they portend war; but adds that horses can be broken to domestic service and thus there is hope of peace in this omen:

et pater Anchises: 'bellum, o terra hospita, portas:  
bello armantur equi, bellum haec armenta minantur.  
sed tamen idem olim curru succedere sueti  
quadrupedes et frena iugo concordia ferre:  
spes et pacis', ait.

It will be remarked that this account of the horse which, while meaning war, may yet be tamed is very similar to the theme of the 1522 play—though the point need not be laboured.

## SHAKESPEARIAN PUNCTUATION— A NEW BEGINNING

By D. F. MCKENZIE

THERE is still a great deal that we should like to know about the punctuation of the Shakespeare First Folio. Dr. Percy Simpson's classic study<sup>1</sup> promoted a discussion which, although prolonged and suggestive, has yielded little in terms of new evidence. In particular, two most important points are still far from clear: first, the nature of the punctuation in the autograph manuscripts or playhouse copies of them used as printer's copy; and, second, the role of the compositor or compositors deputed to set up these manuscripts in type. In fact, we are unlikely to learn very much more about the first until we have come properly to grips with the second.

Lest any should doubt that the compositors had a role in this matter of punctuation, I quote Moxon who is rather late but quite explicit:

The carelessness of some good Authors, and the ignorance of other Authors, has forc'd *Printers* to introduce a Custom, which among them is look'd upon as a task and duty incumbent on the *Compositor*, viz. to discern and amend the bad *Spelling* and *Pointing* of his Copy. . . . As he *Sets* on, he considers how to *Point* his work, viz. when to *Set*, where; when: and where. where to make ( ) where [ ]? ! and when a *Break*.<sup>2</sup>

As Moxon said, 'it is necessary that a *Compositor* be a good English Schollar at least'. And there are, of course, the many pieces of printer's copy (unfortunately none of them dramatic) which show conclusively that compositors had no hesitation in adding to or altering punctuation whenever they thought it necessary.<sup>3</sup>

At least three and almost certainly five different compositors were employed in type-setting the First Folio.<sup>4</sup> The three positively identifiable compositors, distinguished for the most part by their spelling preferences,

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespearian Punctuation* (Oxford, 1911).

<sup>2</sup> *Mechanick Exercises*, ed. H. Davis and H. Carter (London, 1958), pp. 192 and 215.

<sup>3</sup> W. W. Greg, 'An Elizabethan Printer and his Copy', *The Library*, 4th ser., iv (1923), 102-18; and P. Simpson, *Proof-reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London, 1935).

<sup>4</sup> The principal references are: E. E. Willoughby, 'The Printing of the First Folio of Shakespeare', Supplement No. 8 to the *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, 1932; Alice Walker, *Textual Problems of the First Folio* (Cambridge, 1953); and C. J. K. Hinman, 'The Prentice Hand in the Tragedies of the First Folio: Compositor E', *Studies in Bibliography*, ix (1957), 3-20.

have been designated A, B, and E, and it is the attitude towards punctuation in particular of the second of these men, compositor B, that I wish to examine. Not only did he have a particularly large share of the work, but there is reason to believe that he would be much more likely than either A or E to emend his copy as he thought fitting. It is a pity that no text in the Folio itself seems to meet the two conditions necessary for such a study—quite positive evidence of B's presence as well as complete agreement on the nature of the copy used. But Q2 *Merchant of Venice* (1619), one of the Pavier quartos and set by compositor B only two years before the Folio was begun, does meet these conditions. Moreover, because it was virtually unrevised we can use the copy—the Hayes quarto of 1600—as a fairly reliable control text for assessing B's attitudes and general workmanship.<sup>1</sup>

A comparison of Q2 *Merchant* with Q1 reveals something like 3,200 changes in all, most of them inconsequential variants in spelling, but 715 of them involving punctuation. This gives us roughly one change in punctuation for every three and a half lines of text set by compositor B. If this is also his average for the First Folio then it is certainly time that some attention was given to this feature of his work and his changes classified.

Since the figures speak for themselves I give the following analysis with a minimum of comment:

(a) *Commas added or deleted.* This group accounts for over half the total number of changes made to the punctuation.

1. With vocative: in thirty-five instances B inserted a comma after a vocative:

O Lorenzo,

If thou keepe promife, I fhall end this ftrife (II. iii. 19-20)

In seven instances the vocative falls at the end of a sentence, and in such cases is of course preceded by a comma:

Por. Is this true, Nerriſſa? (III. ii. 210)

Twice after a vocative the comma is omitted:

Taylor looke to him. (III. iii. 3)

for the meate fir it fhall be couered (III. v. 66)

<sup>1</sup> I say 'fairly reliable' because we cannot now determine the state of every sheet in the copy of Q1 used by B (although we can determine some of them), nor can we allow in every detail for the changes of a 1619 proof corrector. Such considerations—much more important in the case of substantive variants—are not likely to affect the issue.

The arguments put forward here rest on three assumptions: (a) that Q2 *Merchant* is dependent upon Q1; (b) that Q2 was virtually unrevised—at least in its accidentals; and (c) that Q2 was in fact set by compositor B. For reasons of space it is impossible to give the evidence here, but much of it is discussed in my 'Compositor B's Role in *The Merchant of Venice* Q2 (1619)', *Studies in Bibliography*, xii (1959), 75-90.

2. With imperative: on nine occasions B inserted a comma after an imperative:

I do feast to night,  
My best esteem'd acquaintance, hie thee, go. (II. ii. 180-1)

Twice he omitted such a comma, but the first of these omissions, being at the end of a tight line, was probably due to justification:

Soft, the Iew shall haue all iustice, soft no haft (IV. i. 321)

The second instance is probably the result of a momentary confusion rather than a conscious alteration:

Come you and I will thither presently (IV. i. 455)

3. With word or phrase in apposition: on five occasions B placed a comma before or after a word or phrase in apposition:

How doth that royall Merchant, good *Anthonio*? (III. ii. 242)

and only once omitted such a comma (at III. i. 5).

4. With *and*: compositor B twenty-three times inserted a comma before *and*, occasionally between co-ordinate clauses but often not:

But I should thinke of fhallowes, and of flats,  
And fee my wealthy *Andrew* dockes in fand (I. i. 26-27)

Against this total of twenty-three insertions we have to place only two omissions, one of which occurs in a particularly crowded line (III. ii. 300), and the second of which is at least understandable:

Now by my hood, a Gentile and no Iew. (II. vi. 51)

5. With *or* and *whether*: eight times B placed commas before *or* or *whether*:

And when the tale is told, bid her be iudge,  
Whether *Bassanio* had not once a loue: (IV. i. 276-7)

Although he occasionally followed Q1 in omitting such a comma, he invariably kept those that were present in his copy.

6. Between subject and verb: one example of the nineteen clear instances of a comma being placed between subject and verb (or, occasionally, between verb and object) occurs at IV. i. 247:

For the intent and purpose of the Law,  
Hath full relation to the penalty. (IV. i. 247-8)

At this point some difficulty arises with the classification, for it is often possible to treat commas coming between subject and predicate as more properly related to adjectival or adverbial clauses or to participial constructions. Only instances as obvious as that given in the above example are

therefore included in the present group. No such commas were omitted by B.

7. With relative clauses: compositor B apparently had a very strong tendency to isolate with commas any sort of parenthetical phrase or clause. This is evident not only in his treatment of defining and non-defining relative clauses but also in his handling of participial and prepositional phrases. For example, he added a comma eighteen times before a relative clause and four times after one:

Therefore I part with him, and part with him  
To one, that I would haue him helpe to wafte  
His borrowed purfe. (II. v. 49-51)

*You that choofe not by the view,  
Chance as faire, and choofe as true:* (III. ii. 132-3)

8. With adverbial clauses: B also used a comma with adverbial clauses of comparison, degree, or result on sixteen occasions, with those of time on thirteen occasions, with those of reason or cause on seven occasions, with those of concession twice and with those of place twice, and six times with adverbial clauses of manner or with similes. For these forty-six insertions we have to count but four omissions. Some typical constructions are:

I haue a minde prefaces me fuch thrift,  
That I fould questionleffe be fortunate. (I. i. 175-6)

I know you would be prouder of the worke,  
Then custumary bounty can enforce you. (III. iv. 8-9)

Ere I ope his Letter,  
I pray you tell me how my good friend doth. (III. ii. 235-6)  
By heauen I will nere come in your bed,  
Vntill I fee the ring.

*Ner.* Nor I in yours,  
Till I againe fee mine. (v. i. 190-2)

Then let vs fay you are fad,  
Becaufe you are not merry: and 'twere as eafie  
For you to laugh and leape, and fay you are merry,  
Becaufe you are not fad. (I. i. 47-50)

I feele too much thy bleffing, make it leffe,  
For feare I furfet. (III. ii. 114-15)

There where your Argofies with portly fayle,  
Like Signiors and rich Burgars on the flood, (I. i. 9-10)

9. With participial phrases: similarly we find a comma introduced by B either before or after a participial phrase on twenty-three occasions although only two or three such phrases are used absolutely:

Or go to bed now, being two houres to day: (v. i. 303)

What iudgment fhall I dread, doing no wrong? (iv. i. 89)

Wherever such commas are used in Q1 they are always kept by B.

10. With prepositional phrases: commas inserted with prepositional phrases form a related group:

And with affection wondrous fenfible,  
He wrung *Baffanios* hand (II. viii. 48-49)

Still more foole I fhall appeere,  
By the time I linger heere (II. ix. 73-74)

Altogether, twenty-seven such commas were added in Q2 and only three omitted.

11. With parenthetical statements, &c.: much the same principle may be seen at work in the marking off of more obviously parenthetical statements or phrases:

And fo did mine too, as the matter fals (III. ii. 204)

Firft, there is the Neapolitane Prince. (I. ii. 42)

For mine owne part,  
I haue toward heauen breath'd a fecret vow (III. iv. 26-27)

It is uncertain whether in the following examples the comma marks a parenthesis or an ellipsis of *that*:

In which predicament I fay, thou ftandft (IV. i. 357)

A pound of mans flefh taken from a man,  
Is not fo eftimable, profitable neyther  
As flefh of Muttons, Beefes, or Goats, I fay,  
To buy his fauour, I extend this friendfhip (I. iii. 166-9)

although in the second example it would seem that B took 'I fay' as a parenthetical statement. A more obvious example of the ambiguity that can arise in such instances occurs in the prose lines III. i. 44-45:

but tell vs, do you heare, whether *Anthonio* haue had at loffe a fea [*sic*] or no?

Compositor B inserted eighteen such commas and omitted one (at II. viii. 10).

12. With exclamations: these again form a similar group. B supplied commas after *Well*, *What*, *Why*, and so on twenty-one times but only three times omitted them:

nay, if the fcale do turne  
But in the eftimation of a haire (IV. i. 330-1)

The reading at II. iv. 14 where Q1 gives 'Loue, newes in faith.' is a necessary correction:

Loue newes, in faith.

and the omission at III. i. 104 where the exclamatory 'what' is turned into an interrogative pronoun is probably also intentional:

What, what, what ill lucke, ill lucke?

13. With conditional sentences: another point at which B frequently supplied commas was between the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences:

If you pricke vs, do we not bleede? If you tickle vs, do we not laugh? If you poyfon vs, do wee not dye? And if you wrong vs, fhall we not reuenge? If wee are like you in the reft, we will refemble you in that. (III. i. 66-70)

This he did sixteen times in all. The one omission of such a comma was probably caused by a slight and understandable confusion:

If he will take it fo, if not adiew (I. iii. 170)

where Q1 reads

Yf he wil take it, fo, if not adiew

14. With noun clauses: this accounts for fifteen of the commas added by B:

Then do but fay to me, what I fhould do (I. i. 158)

15. With direct speech and/or ellipsis: in similar fashion, B three times supplied a comma before direct speech:

you will anfwer,  
The flaues are ours (IV. i. 97-98)

His words were, Farewell miftris, nothing elfe. (II. v. 45)

By analogy perhaps B often used a comma to mark the ellipsis of 'that':

Hold here take this, tell gentle Ieffica,  
I will not fayle her (II. iv. 20)

Occasionally a comma might be inserted to mark the ellipsis of a verb:

Chappels had beene Churches, and poore mens cottages, Princes Pallaces  
(I. ii. 14-15)

B supplied such a comma twelve times and omitted it once.

16. Before an infinitive: the last main group into which B's inserted



commas fall is made up of commas placed before an infinitive. There are eighteen of these:

And thefe affume but valours excrement,  
To render them redoubted. (III. ii. 87-88)

But there is come a Meffenger before,  
To fignifie their comming. (V. i. 117-18)

Twice B left out these commas, but one of the omissions (at III. ii. 61) could have been due to confusion with an adverbial phrase incompletely marked off; the other exception occurs at II. ix. 48.

17. Miscellaneous: although there are only a few examples (7), it seems likely that B also preferred to mark off a noun phrase with a comma and to place a comma after each word or phrase in a series:

If to do, were as eafie as to know what were good to do . . . (I. ii. 13)

I might in vertues, beauties, liuings, friends,  
Exceed account (III. ii. 157-8)

Finally, commas are often inserted where a dash or full stop is obviously required but is not given in Q1; twice a comma is placed before a dative; and once after 'for' used as a conjunction.

(b) *Commas changed.* Apart from introducing commas into the text, or occasionally omitting them, compositor B made some 345 other changes in punctuation. As we should expect, the most numerous substitutions are those of a semicolon, colon, or full stop for a comma. However, not all changes strengthen the punctuation: B often set commas for semicolons, colons, and even full stops, and he frequently changed Q1's colons to semicolons. I consider here his treatment of commas.

Usually, as in the following example, there is some justification for B's alteration of thirty-four commas to semicolons:

And many an errour by the fame example,  
Will rush into the ftate; it cannot be. (IV. i. 221-2)

Twenty-eight times he substituted a colon for a comma:

Ile haue my bond, fpeake not againft my bond:  
I haue fworne an oath, that I will haue my bond. (III. iii. 4-5)

and, sometimes in error, sometimes correctly, replaced thirty-two commas by full stops. This is also illustrated in the above example. Despite Q1's extensive use of the question mark, there are numerous examples of its being used in the wrong places (often in the common manner as an

exclamation mark) and not used in the right places. As a rule, B substituted question marks for commas wherever they were needed:

I cannot instantly raife vp the groffe  
Of full three thousand ducats: what of that? (I. iii. 56-57)

Finally, although he usually inserted a comma himself after an exclamation, compositor B once replaced Q1's comma by an exclamation mark:

fourfcore ducates at a fitting! (III. i. 116)

(c) *Semicolons changed.* B's treatment of semicolons seems to point to some indifference to their use, although we often find that he strengthened the punctuation of lengthy sentences:

There muft be needs a like proportion  
Of lineaments, of manners, and of ſpirit:  
Which makes me thinke, that this *Anthonio*  
(Being the bofome-louer of my Lord)  
Muft needs be like my Lord. (III. iv. 14-18)

*Por.* That cannot be,  
This Ring I do accept moſt thankfully,  
And ſo I pray you tell him. (IV. ii. 8-10)

In the first of these examples a colon, and in the second a comma (after 'be'), is substituted for Q1's semicolon. Since B used a heavier stop twenty-four times (colon nine, full stop fifteen) and the lighter ten, we have at least some further evidence of his tendency to increase the weight of punctuation (see also his changes of comma to semicolon in (b) above).

(d) *Colons changed.* Compositor B also varied his treatment of Q1's colons. On fourteen occasions he replaced them by commas:

And true ſhe is, as ſhe hath proo'ud herſelfe,  
And therefore like herſelfe, wife, faire and true (II. vi. 55-56)

(where Q1 in the first line reads 'herſelfe:'). Far more often, however, he used a semicolon where Q1 has a colon, usually before 'and' or 'but':

One halfe of me is yours, the other halfe yours,  
Mine owne I would fay; but if mine then yours,  
And ſo all yours. (III. ii. 16-18)

This he did twenty-eight times. Compositor B substituted a full stop for a colon on thirty occasions:

Let no ſuch man be truſted. Marke the Muſicke. (v. i. 88)

This persistent alteration of Q1's colons may be significant or it may on the other hand simply indicate that B had very few colons in his case and

was forced to make changes. On five occasions he rightly replaced a colon by a question mark.

(e) *Full stops changed.* Some of the changes of a full stop to a comma were doubtless accidental (for example, twice at the end of speeches), but of the eight such changes made some must have been deliberate:

Do as I bid you, fhut doores after you,  
 Faft binde, faft finde, [Q1 find.]  
 A Prouerbe neuer stale in thrifty minde. (II. v. 53-55)

B never put a semicolon for a full stop, though on six occasions he substituted a colon:

Ile haue my bond: I will not heare thee speake (III. iii. 12)

Again he correctly set a question mark nineteen times where Q1 had a full stop:

Talke you of yong M. *Lancelet*? (II. ii. 51)

And once (at III. i. 117) he replaced a full stop by an exclamation mark. Twice by accident a stop was omitted (at II. vi. 32 and III. ii. 216) and necessary stops were twice inserted (at II. ii. 189 and III. ii. 74).

(f) *Question marks changed.* No doubt because they were more liberally supplied with question marks than with full stops, the compositors of Q1 used them with unusual frequency. B made a valiant effort to regularize this form of punctuation. He substituted a comma five times, a semicolon once, a colon three times, and a full stop fifty-three times. He added one question mark and omitted one.

(g) *Parentheses.* Finally, B added parentheses to the text six times and omitted them once. The additions are usually found with phrases like the following:

His Father (though I fay it)  
 Is an honest exceeding poore man (II. ii. 54)

One addition, like the single omission, occurs with a vocative. One bracket misplaced in Q1 was correctly repositioned by B in Q2 (at II. ii. 24).

Whether all the Folio compositors altered punctuation as often as B, and whether they altered it in the same way, will only be revealed when more Jaggard reprints are examined. But it is safe to say that many of the most disturbing features of the Folio punctuation are in fact compositorial, and that although one can see some principles at work many of the changes appear to be erratic. Compositor B's general tendency was clearly to punctuate heavily (of all relevant changes 102 resulted in lighter pointing and 538 in heavier), and for the most part this heavier punctuation was brought about by the addition of commas (these account for 347 of the 715

changes). It is, of course, highly useful to establish this general probability of such changes in a dramatic text set by B, together with others like his preference for heavier pointing at the ends of verse lines (113 commas are inserted within verse lines, 186 at the ends), but for such information to be useful it must be as precise as possible. Hence the above analysis and classification. The evidence of this one play still does not allow us to say with much certainty when and where in particular B would add a comma, or alter a comma to a semicolon, colon, full point, or question mark. But it may help to confirm an editor's suspicion of error. More important, the realization that this compositor's role was far from negligible may make for a more cautious reappraisal of the residual punctuation, some of which might even be Shakespearian.

# SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF POPE AND GAY; AND SOME MANUSCRIPT SOURCES OF GOLDSMITH'S *LIFE OF THOMAS PARNELL*

By C. J. RAWSON

LORD CONGLETON, a descendant of the poet Thomas Parnell's younger brother John, has kindly lent me a collection of manuscripts relating to the poet. Among the most interesting of these is a group of documents wrapped in a piece of white paper marked 'Letters of Pope & Gay to Dr Parnell, 1714 &c.' There are ten letters, four of them unpublished, on nine folded sheets. The first eight sheets are numbered 1 to 8, the ninth is oddly numbered 2 but is here for convenience called MS. 9. They are all family transcripts, not autographs, but attached to MS. 8, a letter from Pope printed by Professor Sherburn from another source, is a substantial strip of the original letter in Pope's hand. The unpublished letters are MSS. 1, 3, and 9, from Gay, and MS. 5 from Pope. The other manuscripts are copies of six letters (MS. 7 consists of two letters), all printed by Professor Sherburn from other sources in his edition of Pope's *Correspondence*. In some cases these copies enable us to fill gaps where Sherburn copied from a damaged original; where Sherburn used a printed source, these manuscripts provide some variants.

The letters all seem to be entirely genuine copies of the originals. Apart from the fact that the strip of Pope's autograph attached to MS. 8 stands in some sort as security for the other transcripts,<sup>1</sup> the hitherto unpublished letters contain a wealth of references entirely consistent with each other and with known events in the lives of the correspondents and the literary history of the years 1714-16, from which the letters all date. The letters all contribute something to our knowledge of Pope, Gay, or the Scriblerus Club. MS. 9 contains a copy of what is probably the earliest version of Pope's satiric poem *To Mr. John Moore*; MSS. 5 and 9 contain what seem to be two early references to the miscellany which Norman Ault christened *Pope's Own Miscellany*; MS. 3 contains a quotation from Gay's *What D'Ye Call It*, sent to Parnell a month before the first performance of the farce; MS. 1 has the earliest reference so far to the Scriblerian figure Esdras Barnivelt, who was to become the supposed author of Pope's *Key to the Lock*.

<sup>1</sup> Three of the other transcripts, MSS. 6, 7a, and 7b, have extant originals; cf. below, p. 384. The transcripts are not all in the same hand, but are on uniform sheets of paper.

The collection of manuscripts is also of interest for what seems to be the strong probability that Goldsmith used it in preparing his *Life of Parnell*. We know that Goldsmith had access to 'materials' supplied by Sir John Parnell, nephew of the poet and ancestor of the present owner of these manuscripts (*Life*, prefixed to Parnell's *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1770), p. xxxv; cf. also p. xxix). All the complete letters printed by Goldsmith are contained in the Congleton manuscripts, and, as I hope to show, his text is usually closer to these manuscripts than to any other text which might have been available to him (cf. below, pp. 384-7); on the other hand, the fact that there are twice as many letters in the manuscripts as in Goldsmith's *Life* makes it clear that the copying cannot have been the other way round. Furthermore, Goldsmith quotes (*Life*, p. xvi) two sentences from letters of Pope which seem never to have been published. The first of these sentences occurs in MS. 5, and reads:

I can easily image to my thoughts the solitary hours of your eremitical life in the mountains, from something parallel to it in my own retirement at Binfield. (cf. MS. 5, below, p. 377)

The letter containing the other sentence seems unfortunately to be lost:

We are both miserably enough situated, God knows; but of the two evils, I think the solitudes of the South are to be preferred to the desarts of the West.

Except for this sentence, Goldsmith quotes no letter, in full or in part, that is not contained in our manuscripts. The letter which contained this sentence either belonged to the same collection of papers and has since been lost; or, just possibly, Goldsmith obtained it from some other source.<sup>1</sup> But the joint coincidence that Goldsmith used 'materials' belonging to Lord Congleton's ancestor, that the text of the letters he prints, as we shall see, almost always agrees with that of our manuscripts, that he prints nothing that is not to be found in these manuscripts, with the exception of one sentence, and that he quotes another sentence from a letter never published, of which the only known copy is MS. 5, overwhelmingly

<sup>1</sup> One further, but unlikely, possibility is that this sentence belongs to the same letter as the previous one, and fills part of a gap in MS. 5 which is discussed below (cf. p. 377 & n. 3; pp. 378-9). It would fit the context reasonably well, though it would not fill the whole gap, which should also include a reference to Pope's *Iliad*, vol. ii, referred to immediately after the gap as 'this Volume'. Goldsmith, after giving the first sentence of the two quoted above (the sentence which is undoubtedly in MS. 5), prefaces the second with the words 'and in another place [Pope says]'. This could mean 'another place in the same letter', but more probably means 'another letter'. If it means the former, the sentence incompletely fills the gap in MS. 5 and leaves unanswered the question how Goldsmith managed to decipher the hypothetical original where the family copyist of MS. 5 failed. If Goldsmith meant 'another letter', that letter is now lost but might easily have belonged with the Congleton manuscripts at one time.

suggests that the Congleton manuscripts were in fact his source. (For further proof, cf. below, p. 377 n. 6, and pp. 384 ff.)

Before proceeding to discuss the manuscript copies of such letters as have already been published from other sources, I give, with Lord Congleton's permission, a text with commentary of the four unpublished letters.

MS. 1, the first of the transcripts in the wrapper inscribed 'Letters of Pope & Gay to Dr Parnell, 1714 &c.', is a letter from Gay. In the transcript the letter is undated and, for some reason, unsigned. For reasons given below, the letter may be dated approximately in April-May 1714 (and thus seems to contain the first extant reference to Esdras Barnivelt). Gay's authorship of the letter is almost beyond doubt, despite the curious omission of any signature in the transcript. The wrapper containing this and nine other transcribed letters restricts their authorship to Pope and Gay on its inscription, and all the other letters are unquestionably by them:<sup>1</sup> and the author of MS. 1 cannot, from internal evidence, be Pope. More important, the letter is written by a member of the Scriblerus Club intimately aware of the Club's doings: since the other full members, Parnell, Pope, Swift, Arbuthnot, and the Earl of Oxford, are all mentioned in the letter in ways which suggest that they cannot be its authors, Gay is left by a process of elimination.

Ye Chariots rolling through the Street  
 Ye Operas with voices Sweet  
 Ye Ladies dress'd in rich array  
 That walk the Park or grace the Play  
 Ye Balls, Assemblies Tea & Ombre  
 And other Pleasures without *Nombre*

Oh Dear Doctor Parnelle, whats all your Trees, your Meadows, y<sup>r</sup> Streams & Plains to a walk in S<sup>t</sup> James's Park, I hope you wont be as profane as to make any comparison of the sight of a Cow & a Calf to a Beau & a Belle? do you imagine a Place beneath a shady Back of equal value, to a Place at Court? no, no, good Doctor, our good & pious Friend Pope stands now at y<sup>r</sup> Elbow ready to confute all these praises of the Country, he knows you can speak as well in the praise of great Men as of great Trees, & that you would as soon go to a Minister of States Levee, as look on a Haycock, or walk in a Dale. M<sup>r</sup> Pope knows I dont care for the trouble of writing, I mean transcribing, & therefore you must not take a blot now & then for want of due respect, besides, I have still the excuse of a

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of MS. 6, which is a transcript of the joint letter from Gay, Jervas, Arbuthnot, and Pope, printed from the original in Sherburn's edition of Pope's *Correspondence* (Oxford, 1956), i. 331-3. Internal evidence in MS. 1 points to Gay's authorship. The half-humorous reference to 'a Place at Court' is characteristic; and the statement that he dislikes 'transcribing' his letters, though they may contain a 'blot', is paralleled in another letter (MS. 9, below, p. 380), by the refusal to alter the letter though it contains an unintentionally poor joke.



sore throat, & a Hoarse, Mr Barnevilt<sup>1</sup> was here, this evening, & entered into a learned Conference with me concerning Homer, he tells me he very much suspects, the accounts we have of that Poet & doubts whether there were ever such a Person in being; he made the same Remark upon Virgil, & Horace & the rest of the Poetical tribe, so that Hardoine<sup>2</sup> hath now found a person to fall in with his oppinions, he complains of Dr Clarke's Book of the Trinity,<sup>3</sup> very much laments the corruption of Politicks, & bewails the absence of Mr Pope. The Dean & I met as usual at Dr Arbuthnot's & the Earle was angry that we did not make him the usual Compliment, Martin still is under the Doctor's hands,<sup>4</sup> & flourishes, I will be sure to take care of those things you mention, | I am, | yours most Sincerely  
you have no Letters

From the opening sentences of this letter it is evident that it was written at a time when Pope and Parnell were together in the country; the closing sentences suggest a period when the Scriblerus Club was very active, and when all its members except Pope and Parnell were, or had been very recently, present in London. The letter must date before August 1714, when Swift left for Ireland, not to return until years after Parnell's death (1718); Gay left London for Hanover on or about 14 June 1714, so that the letter must have been written before then, since Gay did not return until after Swift had left. In late March and early April all the Scriblerians, including Pope and Parnell, were together in London, exchanging the first series of their famous rhymed invitations and meeting frequently (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 216-17, Kerby-Miller, *Memoirs*, pp. 351 ff.); on about 21 April Pope and Parnell went to Binfield to work on Homer (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 216 n. 2), and were there continuously or intermittently until the last week in May, when Pope was writing from Binfield to Parnell in London (i. 225

<sup>1</sup> Barnivelt and his views on Homer were obviously a private joke of the Scriblerus circle. He is made to speak, here, rather like Scriblerus himself; and seems to be identified with an actual person. No such views on Homer seem to have been attributed to Barnivelt in print, but he was the supposed author of Pope's *Key to the Lock*, published in Apr. 1715 but already written before Swift's departure for Ireland in Aug. 1714 (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 251 n. 4, 302 n. 2). The earliest recorded reference to the *Key* is in Pope to Arbuthnot, 7 Sept. 1714. Gay's letter of MS. 1, written in April-May, thus contains the earliest extant reference to Barnivelt; this does not necessarily mean that the *Key* was completed by then. On Barnivelt's place in the Scriblerus scheme, cf. Sherburn, *Early Career of Alexander Pope* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 80-81, and C. Kerby-Miller (ed.), *Memoirs . . . of Martinus Scriblerus* (New Haven, 1950), p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Jean Hardouin of Quimper (1646-1729), a French classical scholar who 'maintained that almost all the ancient Classics were spurious products of the thirteenth century' (J. E. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Cambridge, 1906-8), ii. 298).

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Clarke, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (London, 1712).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Swift to Arbuthnot, 3 July 1714: 'To talk of Martin in any hands but yours, is a folly' (Swift, *Corresp.*, ed. F. E. Ball (London, 1910-14), ii. 162). The Scriblerians also usually met in Arbuthnot's room in St. James's Palace, which he occupied until the Queen's death (1 Aug.).

and n. 1). Parnell seems to have remained in London until Gay's departure for Hanover (i. 230 and n. 1), Swift left London for Letcombe via Oxford at the end of May (i. 228 n. 1). Our letter must belong to the period 21 April-late May, when Pope and Parnell were together at Binfield, when the other Scriblerians were in town, and when the recent meetings of March-April provided an immediate memory of Scriblerian activity. On 4 May Pope and Parnell wrote jointly to Gay a letter which may well be a reply to this one: Parnell refers to Gay's 'fine Pictures' of Town life and urges 'pray leave to tempt us with your description of the Court'; Pope, referring perhaps to the 'sore throat' mentioned by Gay, urges him to come to Binfield 'to amend your health' (i. 222-3). It is possible, on the other hand, that Gay's letter is a reply to the joint letter, insisting afresh that Pope and Parnell should return to London rather than receive him at Binfield.

MS. 3 is a letter from Gay to Parnell, in Ireland, of 29 January 1714/15. The day and month are given at the end of the letter, and the year is easily inferred—for example, from the fact that Gay's *The What D'Ye Call It*, performed on 23 February of that year, is referred to as being 'ready' but not yet 'play'd'.

Dr Dr Parnell | 'Twas with a great deal of impatience, that I expected a Letter from you, for I concluded nothing but sickness cou'd hinder you from writing, to one, who loves you so well. I beg you, to take care of yourself, for I wou'd willingly, have you live as long as I do, & I have no great inclination to quit the world at present. your mouth shall soon, instead of receiving Physick pour forth Eloquence, & your arms, instead of being worn, to be let blood, shall distill Ink, upon paper from your Fingers-Ends to the immortalizing the great name of Zoilus.<sup>1</sup> <I have writ one book> now I am setting you at work perhaps you will ask how I'm employed myself. I have writ one book of the walking the streets,<sup>2</sup> & among us we have just finish'd a Farce in Rhime, of one Act, which is now ready for the Stage.<sup>3</sup> 'tis upon the design I formerly have mention'd to you of a Country Gentleman's having a play acted by his

<sup>1</sup> Parnell's *Life of Zoilus*, with his version of Homer's *Battle of the Frogs and Mice*, was published by Pope in May 1717. The copy money, £16. 2s. 6d., was given to Gay (Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes* (London, 1812-15), viii. 296).

<sup>2</sup> *Trivia: or, the Art of Walking the Streets of London* was not published until a year later, on 26 Jan. 1715/16. It was in three books, of which Gay had so far completed one. As early as 30 Dec. 1714 Gay had quoted from the first book in a letter to Ford (D. Nichol Smith (ed.), *Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 223-4).

<sup>3</sup> The 'Farce' is *The What D'Ye Call It*, which was produced at Drury Lane on 23 Feb. 1714/15. Although in a later letter to Parnell, of 18 Mar., Gay referred to 'my What-d'-ye-call-it' (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 285), the phrase 'among us' in MS. 3 seems to suggest that Gay had more than one collaborator, the two likeliest being his Scriblerian associates, Pope and Arbuthnot. A copy of 'Mr. Gay's new Farce' was sent to Parnell in due course (i. 284). The play, when published, was in two acts, not one. The quoted passage is from Act I, Sc. i.

Tenants. that you see something of the nature of it I have transcrib'd a speech of an Aunt to a Bench of Justices for saving her nephew from being Press'd.

O Tyrant Justices, have you forgot  
 how my poor Brother was in Flanders Shot?  
 you press'd my Brother.—he shall walk in white  
 He shall—and shake your Curtains ev'ry Night  
 what thoff a poultry Hare he rashly Kill'd  
 That cross'd the Furrows while he plough'd the Field?  
 you sent him o'er the Hills and far away  
 left his old mother to the Parish pay  
 with whome he shar'd his Ten Pence ev'ry day  
 Wat kill'd a Bird, was from his Farm turn'd out  
 you took the law of *Thomas* for a Trout:  
 you ruin'd my poor Uncle, at the Sizes  
 and made him pay *nine Pounds* for Nisiprizes.  
 now will you press my harmless Nephew too?  
 Ah! what has Conscience with the Rich to do  
 —Thoff in my Hand, no silver Tankard shine,  
 nor my dry Lip is dy'd with Claret wine—  
 yet I can sleep in Peace—

{The Justice takes  
 up a large  
 silver Tankard &  
 drinks

after this is play'd, I fully design, to pursue the Street Walking with Vigour, & let nothing interfere but a place, which at present, I have but little Prospects of, so that I must rub on as well as I can in hope that Gazettes, will some time or other be my Friend. Rowe has finish'd his Play, and designs to go to the House with it this Week;<sup>1</sup> Mr Pope is deeply engaged among Printers, & Booksellers; Phillips is made Paymaster to one of the Lotterys, and is publishing a Miscellany.<sup>2</sup> all the Politicians are employ'd in Elections, and they search the News Papers, for Whigs, & Tories just as I do the Lottery Paper for my chance of one Tickett. I see Mr Harcourt often & Dr Arbuthnot, & we never fail to remember you and the Dean, pray give my humble service to him, & forget not to write to me. | Dear Doctor Parnell I am | your most affectionate | Humble Serv<sup>t</sup> | JG.

London | Jan<sup>r</sup> 29<sup>th</sup>

MS. 5 is an undated transcript of a letter (or, just possibly, of parts of two letters) from Pope, evidently written about March 1715/16; the second sentence of this letter was published in part in Goldsmith's *Life of Parnell*, but the rest is previously unpublished (cf. above, p. 372):

I hope to be remembred, by you, more & more frequently as you approach

<sup>1</sup> This is evidently *The Tragedy of Lady Jane Gray*, which was not, however, produced until 20 Apr. (i. 288 n. 5).

<sup>2</sup> Ambrose Philips's projected Miscellany was announced in *The London Gazette* of 8 Jan., but was not published (i. 276 n. 3). Philips was one of the authors ridiculed in *The What D'Ye Call It*. For his Lottery post, cf. M. G. Segar (ed.), *The Poems of Ambrose Philips* (Oxford, 1937), p. xl.

nearer & nearer towards us; & that I may feel the warmth of your Freindship, like that of the Sun, redoubling as it returns. I can easily image to my thoughts the Solitary hours of your Eremitical Life, in the mountains from something so pallel to it, in my own retirement at Binfield—but Binfield, alas! is no more and the Muse is driven, from those Forests of which she sung. the Day may shortly come, when your Friend may too literally apply

nos Patriae fines, & dulcia linquimus arva<sup>1</sup>

when he may look back with regret, on the Paradise he has lost, and have only the consolation of poor Adam

The world lies all before him, where to chuse  
His place of rest, & Providence his Guide.<sup>2</sup>

[Between these lines and the remainder of the letter there is a gap of about two inches in the manuscript.<sup>3</sup>]

your Treatise of Zoilus, with the excellent Translation of the *Batrachomachia*, will be extremely seasonable at this time, to follow immediately, upon the publication of this Volume.<sup>4</sup> *Psycarpax*<sup>5</sup> was not more regretted by his own Father, than he has been by Gay & me these ten months The *Pervigilium Veneris* also is desired with impatience, which together with any other of your occasional Peices, will be the saving of a whole miscellany, wherein both Gay, & I have some unrighteous works to answer for.<sup>6</sup> Pray before you commit,

<sup>1</sup> Virgil, *Eclog.*, i. 3. This is perhaps a reference to the possibility that Pope might have to leave the country if the position of the Roman Catholics, then particularly difficult, were to become any worse. Pope quoted the line from Virgil with similar purport in a letter to Caryll of 20 Mar. 1715/16 (*Corresp.*, i. 337), and Gay, in the letter to Parnell in MS. 9, again quotes the line in connexion with Pope's departure from Binfield. The line was evidently a favourite of both Pope and Gay; in summer 1714 Gay had quoted it, in another context, in a letter to Ford (*Letters of Swift to Ford*, p. 222).

<sup>2</sup> *Paradise Lost*, xii. 646-7. Pope misquotes slightly.

<sup>3</sup> This gap may mean that the manuscript consists of parts of two letters, or that there was an illegible portion in the original autograph; cf. below, pp. 378-9. For the possible contents of the gap, cf. above, p. 372 n.

<sup>4</sup> Parnell's *Zoilus* (an attack on Dennis) and his translation of Homer's *Batrachomachia* were not published until May 1717, but Pope had by then been urging Parnell for over two years to send him the manuscripts of these works. By 'this Volume', Pope probably means vol. ii of his *Iliad*, which appeared on 22 Mar. 1715/16. The *Zoilus* would have been 'seasonable' as an attack on the critics of Pope's translation.

<sup>5</sup> A character in the *Batrachomachia*. His death is mourned by his father in the poem (Parnell, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1722), pp. 81 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> The reference is probably to 'Pope's Own Miscellany', *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1717), which Pope seems to have planned long before 1717, apparently mentioning it in a letter to Broome, 6 Dec. 1715 (*Corresp.*, i. 321; N. Ault (ed.), *Pope's Own Miscellany* (London, 1935), p. xviii). Neither Parnell's *Pervigilium Veneris* nor anything else of his was included, except his Latin version of part of *The Rape of the Lock*. In a letter to Parnell of 6 July 1717 Pope seems to allude to his omission of Parnell's contributions (*Corresp.*, i. 415-16 & n.). For Gay's part in the volume, cf. Ault, p. xxiii. Goldsmith wrote: 'When Pope had a miscellany to publish, he applied to Parnell for poetical assistance' (*Life*, p. xxiv). Since there is no such explicit application in the letters which Goldsmith prints, and since the request is made in MS. 5 and referred to by Gay in MS. 9 (below, p. 381), Goldsmith's words suggest that he was referring to these manuscripts.

w<sup>t</sup> I think so valuable to any Hand, or messenger, acquaint me by Letter, in what manner, and at what time & place I may be sure, to come at them in London. What further commands you may have, either in regard to my acknowledging the Essay,<sup>1</sup> or the method of publishing, what you shall favor us with, I beg you to convey at same time. My Homer has met in general, with great Candour, & Favour from the World. no Critick (since the Idle Book call'd Homerides,<sup>2</sup> which was a Critick ante Manum) has appear'd against it.—*Trivia* was sent to you, & the Dean, by the hands of Dr Ellwood, to whom I desire you to assure of my sincere respect, and affectionate service. The Dean I can hardly speak of, I am so full of the thoughts of him; in that one particular, the whole world might learn of me, to think justly. I cannot conclude more agreeably, than by telling you, the greatest Truths I know which are the Persons you name, & select, out of all England, to be commended to, are entirely your Friends & constant Commemorators: and that I am, with the utmost Esteem, Gratitude, & Fidelity, | Dr Sir | your most unfeigned Friend | and ever affectionate Serv<sup>t</sup> | A. Pope.

I take it unkindly you should | ask of my health, without | informing me of yours. pray repair | that fault, in your next, & that | most speedily.

The problem of dating this letter (assuming that it is one letter and not a pair of fragments) is a little difficult. Pope's final departure from Binfield occurred soon after 20 March 1715/16, since on that day he wrote to Caryll that he had come to Binfield 'to take my last look and leave of' it (*Corresp.*, i. 336). If, as seems likely, Pope is referring to vol. ii of the *Iliad* (22 Mar.) in the remark about the seemingly impending 'publication of this Volume', the two parts of the letter must appear to clash slightly: it is odd that Pope should write to Parnell in Ireland after 20 March suggesting that the *Life of Zoilus* might 'follow immediately' after the publication of a volume which was to appear on 22 March, for this could hardly happen even if Parnell sent Pope the manuscript by return of post. Either the first part of the letter is in fact a fragment from another and later letter, or Pope is only anticipatively lamenting the loss of Binfield when he says that 'Binfield, alas! is no more!':<sup>3</sup> in the latter case, both parts of the letter might belong to early March or even late February.

<sup>1</sup> Probably the 'Essay on the Life, Writings and Learning of Homer', which Parnell wrote for Pope and which was prefixed to vol. i of the *Iliad* (publ. 6 June 1715). Pope may be asking how he should acknowledge Parnell's anonymous assistance.

<sup>2</sup> *Homerides: or, a Letter to Mr. Pope, Occasion'd by his intended Translation of Homer*, by Thomas Burnet and George Duckett, appeared in Mar. 1714/15.

<sup>3</sup> Or, in another sense, he might be said to have lost Binfield even before his last visit on about 20 Mar., since he was obviously absent from it before that visit, which he must have known would be short, and might thus easily feel himself dispossessed of it in his absence. Doubtless, too, negotiations for the sale of Binfield were in progress by early March, if the property was not indeed already sold (*Corresp.*, i. 337 n. 4).

That the second part of the letter dates before 22 March, when vol. ii of the *Iliad* appeared, and that 'this Volume' can be identified with vol. ii, is indirectly borne out by the reference to the sending to Parnell of Gay's *Trivia* 'by the hands of Dr Ellwood'. *Trivia* was published on 26 January, and John Elwood, sometime Vice-Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, seems (from another source) to have left London with Parnell's copy well before 22 March. In a joint letter from Gay, Jervas, Arbuthnot, and Pope to Parnell, which also mentions the impending publication of vol. ii of the *Iliad* and which Sherburn tentatively dates some time in February (and which must in any case have been written between 26 January and 22 March), Gay wrote, with obvious reference to *Trivia*: 'in the Summer I wrote a Poem & in the Winter I have publish'd it, which I have sent to you by Dr Elwood' (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 331 and n. 2). Thus at least the second part of our MS. 5 belongs to roughly the same time as the joint letter, more precisely late February or early March. If the gap between the first and second parts of our MS. 5, and the rather abrupt transition of subject-matter between the two parts, mean that the two parts belong to different letters, then the first part, referring to the loss of Binfield, may be dated in late March or early April. But none of our other transcripts gives anything but whole letters, and the gap in MS. 5 may simply be due to a passage in Pope's original autograph which the transcriber could not decipher: in that case, Pope's reference to the loss of Binfield must be anticipative, and the whole would then seem to belong to early March (i.e. near to the time of the final departure from Binfield, and at the same time early enough for Pope to be able to speak of the possible publication of the *Life of Zoilus* 'immediately' after that of vol. ii of the *Iliad* on 22 March).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pope's references to the *Zoilus*, the *Batrachomyomachia*, and the *Pervigilium Veneris* do not help with the dating of the letter. The first two were not published till May 1717, and the translation of the Latin poem only appeared in Parnell's posthumous *Poems* (London, 1722), published by Pope. Pope had been asking Parnell for the manuscripts of the first two since at least as early as 18 Mar. 1714/15 (*Corresp.*, i. 284), and seems to have received them only shortly before publication in 1717. Pope's statement in MS. 5 that Psycarpax, the heroic mouse in *Batrach.*, 'has been [regretted] by Gay & me these ten months', seems puzzling. Either Parnell himself is jokingly referred to (and he had left England in Nov. 1714, well over ten months before), or, more likely, it is the poem which Pope and Gay have not seen for ten months. But a year ago, on 18 Mar. 1714/15, Pope was urging Parnell to send the poem over, and we know only of his having seen it, or a draft of it, as early as 13 Sept. 1714, before Parnell had left England (i. 253). Either Pope saw another draft of the poem in summer 1715, or the 'ten months' are a lapse of memory. The reference to the *Pervigilium Veneris* similarly does not help with the dating of MS. 5. Pope had seen Parnell's translation some time before, and in the joint letter of c. Feb. 1715/16 he praised it while asking Parnell to send it over (i. 333); almost a year before, on 7 Apr. 1715, he was already asking for it (i. 292), and we do not know when he finally received it. Perhaps it was one of the 'pieces you entrusted to my care' to which Pope referred on 6 July 1717 (i. 415).



MS. 9 is a letter from Gay to Parnell in Ireland written on a Monday in March 1715/16, probably the 26th.<sup>1</sup> Reasons for this dating are given below. The contents of the letter are related to those of Pope's letter in MS. 5. Gay's letter gives in full the text of Pope's satiric poem *To Mr. John Moore* some weeks before its surreptitious publication by Curll. MS. 9 is unfortunately a damaged transcript, frayed at the edges, badly damp-stained, and with parts of the paper torn away and pasted under with blank paper. Its legibility, even with photographic aids, is therefore limited; conjectural or unclear readings are given in square brackets. (I have been greatly assisted by Mr. W. O'Sullivan, of Trinity College, Dublin, in deciphering this manuscript.)

London, Monday

My Dear Parnelle,

I write this from Mr Lintots Shop where pray direct to me for the future, being just come to Town from Epsom with Dr Arbuthnot,<sup>2</sup> but I was resolv'd not to neglect a Post tho' I only shoud acquaint you w<sup>th</sup> what I hope you knew before, that I love you, Pope I expect to town tonight from Binfield, where he has been these three or four days & now quits it for ever, nos Patriae fines & dulcia linquimus arva,<sup>3</sup> I don't love Latin quotations but you must consider him as a pastor [and wri]ter.<sup>4</sup> Binfield alas is sold. the Trees of Windsor Forest shall no more listen to y<sup>e</sup> tunefull reed of the [? Popeian] swain & no more Beeches shall be wounded w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> names of Teresa & Patty. Teresa & Patty too are forced to leave y<sup>e</sup> Groves of Mapledurham their Brother having forsaken a Mother [? & sisters &] taken unto himself a wife,<sup>5</sup> as Binfield is for ever sold when I took my leave of Pope I recommended Bounce to his care as he was a f[riend of his] and of y<sup>rs</sup>. I believe you [ ]<sup>6</sup> humanity than to neglect [either] his dog or his friend, what I got by walking the streets,<sup>7</sup> I am now spending in riding in Coaches & as I draw on the Bank but seldom & with much caution I believe [I] will scarce break it. I was dissappointed that you said nothing of y<sup>r</sup> m[ice] & Frogs. as Ireland curst y<sup>e</sup> man that carried frogs first into it, so England is no less disoblidged to you for carrying your Frogs from us.<sup>8</sup> I have aimed att a Conceit, but since I writ it down find it is a poor

<sup>1</sup> I number it MS. 9 for convenience. It is numbered '2' in pencil and seems originally to have been grouped separately from MSS. 1-8.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot trace the activities of Gay and Arbuthnot in Epsom at this time.

<sup>3</sup> Virgil, *Eclóg.*, i. 3; cf. above, p. 377 n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> This seems the likeliest reading of faint traces of script under damp-stain. Gay is saying that, although he does not 'love Latin quotations', his quotation from Virgil's *Eclógue* is appropriate since Pope (himself the author of pastorals) may be considered a shepherd as well as a poet.

<sup>5</sup> The marriage of Michael Blount in 1715 forced his mother and sisters Teresa and Martha to leave Mapledurham (Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 315 n. 4). Pope to Caryll, 20 Mar. 1715/16, suggests that the ladies have already moved (i. 336).

<sup>6</sup> A gap of over half a line, the paper being torn.

<sup>7</sup> *Trivia* was published on 26 Jan.; it is mentioned in MSS. 3 and 5 above, pp. 375, 379.

<sup>8</sup> A common private joke among Parnell's friends (cf. Pope, *Corresp.*, i. 284, 376-7). The immediate reference is to Parnell's translation of the *Batrachomyomachia* or *Battle of the*



one, but I have taken a resolution not to blott my letter. If you don't know what I mean lett us immediatly appoint a meeti[ng] in England & I will Explain myself.

The Miscellany that Pope mentiond<sup>1</sup> is to be printed by Lintot w<sup>c</sup>[h]<sup>2</sup> will be publish'd I suppose if materials come in, in a month or two. I am oblidged to your Bookworm,<sup>3</sup> now I talk of Worms I must just acquaint you of an odd adventure that has lately happend att Buttons, some People have lately taken a Whim of [mak]ing some of the Gentlemen of that Coffee house void worms of a [? monstro]us size [? for ad]vertisements by M<sup>r</sup> John Moore's worm powder [? which] as you are an advertisement reader you are undoubtedly acquainted with [.] the aforesaid Gent<sup>n</sup> are Extreemly angry att this treatment & whenever Politicks will give them leave the topick of their conversation is altogether upon worms a friend [? or two]<sup>4</sup> has writ this congratulato[ry] Poem to D<sup>r</sup> Moore<sup>5</sup>

To y<sup>e</sup> ingenious M<sup>r</sup> John [Moore Author of the] celebrated Worm Powder<sup>6</sup>

## I

How much Egregious Moore are we  
Decievd by Shows & Forms  
What'eer we think, what'eer [we see,]  
All human Race are worms

## 2

Man is a very worm by Birth  
Vile Reptile, Proud & Vain.  
Awhile he crawls upon y<sup>e</sup> Earth  
Then shrinks in Earth again

## 3

That Woman is a worm we find  
E'er since our Grandam's Evil  
She first conversed with her own kind  
That ancient worm, the Devil

*Frogs and Mice* (above, p. 379 n. 1), the manuscript of which Parnell had taken back to Ireland with him in 1714, thus introducing frogs into that country for the first time since the expulsion of reptiles and batrachians from it by St. Patrick (for a reference to the legend, cf. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.*, ed. C. Plummer (Oxford, 1896), ii. 10).

<sup>1</sup> On the Miscellany see above, p. 377 n. 6. Pope had mentioned it in MS. 5. Gay is perhaps referring to this letter, apparently written some days before his.

<sup>2</sup> 'And' or '&' would give a better construction, but the *w* is clear.

<sup>3</sup> Parnell's 'The Bookworm' first appeared in the *Poems* (London, 1722).

<sup>4</sup> Conjectural, from a faint trace of script. One of the 'friends' is almost certainly Pope.

<sup>5</sup> The poem was first surreptitiously published by Curll on 1 May 1716, over a month after this letter was written (Pope, *Minor Poems*, ed. N. Ault and J. Butt (London, 1954), p. 163). On the topical significance of the poem, and on its butt, cf. this edition and Sherburn, *Early Career*, p. 175. As Sherburn suggests, Curll probably got his text 'through Pope's allowing friends to have copies' (*Early Career*, p. 184), which, as Gay's letter illustrates, Pope clearly did.

<sup>6</sup> Pope subsequently printed the poem, omitting the fourth stanza, which Curll had included, and which is included here. For textual and other details, cf. *Minor Works*, pp. 161-4. Our text is nearer to Curll's, as being doubtless a copy of the original version which Curll used, but there are small variants from both versions, which I do not list in the notes.

4

But whether [Man] or He, [God knows,]  
 Fecundified her [B]elly  
 With that pure stuff from whence we rose  
 The genial Vermicelli

5

The Learned themselves we Bookworms name  
 The Blockhead is a slow worm  
 The nymph whose tail is all on Flame  
 Is aptly term'd, a Glow worm

6

The Fops are painted Butterflies  
 that flutter for a day  
 first from a worm they take their rise  
 And in a Worm decay.

7

The Flatterer an Earwig grows  
 Some worms suit all conditions  
 Misers are Muckworms, Silkworms Beaux  
 And Deathwatches Physicians

8

That Statesmen have y<sup>e</sup> Worms is seen  
 By all their winding Play  
 Their conscience is a worm within  
 That gnaws them night & day

9

Ah Moore thy Skill were well Employed  
 And Greater Gains woud rise  
 If thou couldst make y<sup>e</sup> Courtier void  
 The worm that never dyes.

10

O Learned friend of Abchurch Lane  
 Who setts our Entrails free  
 Vain is thy Art, thy Powders vain  
 Since worms shall eat ev'n thee

11

Tho[u] only can[st our] fate adjourn  
 Some few short years no more  
 Ev'n Buttons Witts to w[orms shall] turn  
 Who Maggots were before

## &lt;12&gt;

S<sup>r</sup> R S. writ as I am informd the Preface with y<sup>e</sup> Assistance of Hoadly &c.<sup>1</sup>  
 M<sup>r</sup> Lintot publishd Oedipus<sup>2</sup> since & will send it. lett the dean know that  
 what I write to y<sup>u</sup> is Equal[ly] meant to<sup>3</sup> him for no one loves you both better |  
 J Gay

Our only piece of evidence for dating this letter with any precision is the reference to Pope's last visit to Binfield, where 'he has been these three or four days & now quits it for ever', together with the fact that Gay was writing on a Monday. On 20 March 1715/16 Pope wrote to Caryll from Binfield, 'which I am come to take my last look and leave of' (*Corresp.*, i. 336 and n. 6). The two Mondays nearest to 20 March (o.s.) were 19 and 26 March, and since Gay was expecting Pope back in 'town tonight' it must be the later Monday (unless Pope was expected on the 19th but remained at Binfield until at least the following day). Other references in the letter (except the return of Gay and Arbuthnot from Epsom, which I cannot discover anything about) belong more generally to the period but do not enable us to fix any precise date in themselves, or help us to confirm the probable dating of 26 March. On the other hand, these references (as the footnotes show) are in keeping with the events and preoccupations of the early part of 1716, and Gay's letter has much in common with Pope's letter of MS. 5, which seems to have been written earlier in March (cf. pp. 380-381 nn., for references to common events and topics, other than the sale of Binfield, in both letters). Gay's letter was thus probably written on Monday, 26 March, or, less plausibly, on the previous Monday, 19 March.

The remaining manuscripts are family transcripts of six letters from Pope, some written jointly with others, and printed by Sherburn from other sources, sometimes originals. Some of the manuscripts throw interesting light on Sherburn's text.

MS. 2 contains the letter from Pope and Gay printed in *Corresp.*, i. 284-5, from Goldsmith's *Life* (Parnell, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1770), pp. xxxiii-xxxv). Apart from a few minor variants of

<sup>1</sup> 'S<sup>r</sup> R S.' is Steele. Benjamin Hoadly, the Bishop of Bangor, 'had a hand in the anti-Catholic propaganda, *An Account of the State of the Roman Catholick Religion* published in Steele's name—the Dedication to the Pope and probably the Preface of both editions being [Hoadly's] (1715 and 1716 . . .)' (R. Blanchard (ed.), *Correspondence of Richard Steele* (Oxford, 1941), p. 118). Gay is doubtless referring to the *Account*, in reply to a query from Parnell.

<sup>2</sup> In 1715 Lintot printed Theobald's translation of the *Oedipus* of Sophocles.

<sup>3</sup> An unsatisfactory reading, especially as the last two letters of 'Equal[ly]' are omitted. I add them conjecturally since I can find no other reading to fit what seems to be the surrounding text. The dean, of course, is Swift.

spelling and punctuation, and a few variants of phrasing (e.g. *Corresp.*, i. 284, l. 2, 'a good deal', MS. 2 'much'), MS. 2 gives 'Bishop of Salisbury's Elegy' as against 'Bishop of Ailsbury's Elegy' (cf. i. 284 n. 9).

MS. 4 contains the letter from Pope printed in *Corresp.*, i. 395-6, from Goldsmith (pp. xii-xv). Apart from minor variants, the passage in i. 396, l. 16, 'give, (which . . .)', reads, in MS. 4: 'give, from y<sup>e</sup> instant you see that book (w<sup>ch</sup> . . .)', a reading which gives tidier syntax. For some reason, there is in MS. 4 a gap of several inches from the end of the penultimate paragraph to the foot of the page, the last paragraph beginning on a fresh page.

MS. 6 (Goldsmith, pp. xviii-xxii) contains the joint letter from Gay, Jervas, Arbuthnot, and Pope printed in *Corresp.*, i. 331-3, from the original in Trinity College, Dublin. In Gay's contribution to the letter 'Two lines . . . are heavily scored out' in the T.C.D. manuscript, but the overscored passage is given by Goldsmith, and printed by Sherburn in a note (i. 331 n. 5): MS. 6 also gives this passage, as in Goldsmith. MS. 6 is a careless copy; among other errors, it corrupts 'Glacialis Ierne' of the opening of Arbuthnot's contribution (i. 332) to 'Glacialis of Ierne'. MS. 6 shares with Goldsmith some variants from the original which suggest that it was Goldsmith's copy (cf. above, pp. 372-3). Gay's portion opens 'My Dear Doctor' (i. 331), while MS. 6 and Goldsmith read 'My Dear Sir'; Jervas merely initialled his portion (i. 332), while MS. 6 and Goldsmith give 'C. Jervas'; Arbuthnot's section is unsigned (i. 333), but his name is given in MS. 6 and Goldsmith. In line seven of Jervas's portion, 'therefore' (i. 332) becomes 'tho few' in MS. 6, an inferior reading adopted also by Goldsmith. In line nine of Arbuthnot's section (i. 332), 'exchequer Bills' becomes 'exchange Bills' in MS. 6 and Goldsmith. Where MS. 6 gives a clearly unacceptable reading, Goldsmith corrects. He restores 'Glacialis Ierne'. Where in the original Pope wrote 'carvd his best Statue' (i. 333), MS. 6 meaninglessly copied 'caus'd his best Statue' and Goldsmith found himself compelled to emend to 'raised his best statue'—an emendation which proves that his source was at any rate not the original, and strongly corroborates the view that it was MS. 6.

MS. 7 contains two letters from Pope, which I shall call 7a and 7b. The text of MS. 7a is printed in *Corresp.*, i. 253, from the original belonging to Mr. A. A. Houghton, Jr. There are a few variants, two especially in the penultimate paragraph: 'dull Critical Learning' and 'a coach or two' become in MS. 7a 'damnd criticall learning' and 'a week or two'. The letter is not in Goldsmith.

MS. 7b is of more interest. Printed in *Corresp.*, i. 348-9, from the imperfect original in T.C.D., Sherburn's text has gaps which he fills from Goldsmith (pp. vi-viii), and others which Goldsmith does not supply but

which can now be filled from MS. 7b. I discuss these below. Where MS. 7b and the original vary, Goldsmith usually agrees with MS. 7b. Thus:

- i. 348, l. 5 'should', MS. 7b 'woud', Goldsmith 'would',
- i. 348, l. 15 'zealously', MS. 7b and Goldsmith 'ardently',
- i. 348, l. 18 'you not', MS. 7b 'not y<sup>u</sup>', Goldsmith 'not you',

and most of the gaps in the defective original, filled and printed in square brackets by Sherburn from Goldsmith, can be identically filled from MS. 7b. But sometimes Goldsmith differs from both manuscripts. The second paragraph, as printed by Sherburn from the original, opens:

To tell you that both Mr Gay and myself have written [severa]l Letters in vain, that we are constantly enquiring of [all w]ho have seen Ireland if they saw you, and that (for[gotten] as we are) we are ev'ry day remembering you in our [most] agreeable hours; all this is as true as that we are [sincer]ely Lovers of you. . .<sup>1</sup>

MS. 7b reads:

to tell y<sup>u</sup> that both M<sup>r</sup> Gay & myself have written several letters in vain, that we are constantly Enquiring of all who have seen Ireland, if they saw you, & that (forgotten as we are) we are every day remembering you in our most agreeable hours all this is true, as that we are sincerely lovers of you. . .

And Goldsmith:

I need not tell you, that both Mr. Gay and myself have written several letters in vain; that we are constantly enquiring of all who have seen Ireland, if they saw you, and that (forgotten as we are) we are every day remembering you in our most agreeable hours. All this is true, as that we are sincerely lovers of you. . .

Sherburn comments on Goldsmith's 'impossible' reading, I think unfairly. Certainly Goldsmith's is the corrupt text in that it differs from the original as well as from MS. 7b, which was probably copied from the original. It is surely the original which has disturbing syntax, since its opening main clause has no main verb. The sentence is an anacoluthon, albeit a lively and acceptable one, and Goldsmith's 'I need not tell you' is obviously an attempt to restore it to correct syntax. If, as is almost certain, Goldsmith was using MS. 7b rather than the original, he would be even more tempted to emend (as he had probably done with the more impossible readings of MS. 6) since the haphazard and inadequate punctuation of the transcript makes the original sentence even more confused (some of the punctuation

<sup>1</sup> Sherburn's text, including the brackets. Oddly, the brackets do not in this case represent gaps in the original, which I have examined.

in MS. 7b, e.g. the last comma in the quoted passage—after 'true'—was added after the transcription in different ink). Moreover, Goldsmith shares with MS. 7b the reading 'all this is true, as' against the original's 'all this is as true as', and the spelling 'agreeable' against the original's 'agreable'. It is true that the original manuscript in T.C.D. has a note, quoted by Sherburn (i. 348 n. 1), which says: 'The letter when copied by G[oldsmith] was perfect.' This proves nothing: since the T.C.D. manuscript is defective, and since its gaps are plausibly supplied by Goldsmith, the author of the note (doubtless an official of the library), unaware of the family transcript MS. 7b, would perfectly reasonably assume that Goldsmith used the original and that the original was in good order when he copied it. It now seems safer to say only that the original 'was perfect' when copied by the Parnell family scribe. That the scribe copied from the original before it had become damaged, and that Goldsmith copied from MS. 7b, is further borne out by the second half of the postscript to Pope's letter: this contains two gaps in the damaged original but is complete in MS. 7b. I give the texts of Sherburn and of MS. 7b:

If you ever see Mr Caldwell, assure him [ ] & let him know I have since written to [ ] one letter, with a little parcel I deliverd

If you Ever see Mr Caldwell Assure him of my hearty service | & lett him know I have twice written to him without an Answer | one letter w<sup>th</sup> a little parcell I deliverd to y<sup>e</sup> Provost for him

The gaps in the original cannot for once be filled from Goldsmith, who omits the passage for an easily explainable reason. In MS. 7b the first half of the postscript, of which our sentence is the second half, ends at the foot of a page. It is a sentence in its own right and might easily seem to complete the letter. The very last sentence, by itself on the verso, would easily be overlooked by anyone copying from MS. 7b. All the evidence, positive and negative, thus points to MS. 7b as Goldsmith's source. He often shares his variants with MS. 7b; when he departs from both MS. 7b and the original it is because the reading in MS. 7b (as a corruption of the original) seems strongly to require emendation;<sup>1</sup> and even Goldsmith's

<sup>1</sup> Two important divergencies from the original (and MS. 7b) in Goldsmith, noted by Sherburn (i. 349 nn. 1-2), are only apparent. Printing (i. 348-9) '... a thousand Loves, a thousand Compliments & Commissions', Sherburn comments 'Loves and a thousand Commissions Goldsmith. Elwin prints *Complaints* instead of *Compliments*. Goldsmith's text is faulty; all we have of either *complaints* or *compliments* is the first syllable.' Goldsmith's reading, in the *Life* prefixed to Parnell's *Poems* (London, 1770), is in fact '... a thousand loves, and a thousand complaints, and a thousand commissions', which Elwin copied, as he did the whole letter, from Goldsmith (Pope, *Works* (London, 1871-89), vii. 463). MS. 7b reads as Goldsmith, omitting the first 'and', in which it agrees with the original. Again, Sherburn (rightly) prints (i. 349) '... (in spite of the [longest neglect or] Absence)' but comments 'neglect of happiness Goldsmith (an error)', while Goldsmith reads in fact 'neglect or absence', as does Elwin. MS. 7b, but for punctuation, agrees, having the

omission of part of the postscript which is in both manuscripts interestingly points to MS. 7*b* as his source. More general reasons for supposing the Congleton manuscripts to have been used by Goldsmith are given above (pp. 372-3).

MS. 8 contains the letter from Pope printed in *Corresp.*, i. 225-6, from another eighteenth-century transcript, now in T.C.D. There is one variant of interest: i. 226, l. 8 'Reverend Person', Goldsmith (p. xi) 'reverend parson', MS. 8 'Reverend Parson' as in Goldsmith, but with the second, third, and fourth letters of 'Parson' in darker ink, covering what was perhaps originally 'ers'.

But MS. 8 is chiefly of interest because, pinned to its blank front page, is a fragment of the original letter in Pope's hand, a vertical strip about  $7 \times 1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, which reads:

me to y<sup>e</sup> last degree | times should have | knew you in best | several Miracles |  
people fond of a | [pap]lists of a Clergy = | Nurse herself | Old age, & (for | for  
y<sup>r</sup> sake be- | master.—In | good reasons for | [t]wo, by y<sup>e</sup> next post, | up to  
you, tho' | present: My Hours | [befor]e. But Perhaps you | [a]way y<sup>r</sup> own  
Works. | Hackney Scribbler, | [U]niversity, I a poor | You are a Reverend | are  
D<sup>r</sup> Parnelle | ) and I | obliged & affectionat[e] | [Frien]d & faithful Serv<sup>t</sup> |  
[De]von. A. Pope.<sup>1</sup>

parentheses in common with the original. Goldsmith is thus, after all, not in error; and the greater closeness, in accidentals, of MS 7*b* to the original in both cases argues that MS. 7*b* is, rather than Goldsmith, the *direct* copy of the original. Professor Sherburn, who did me the kindness of reading this article in typescript, informs me that he used the later text of Goldsmith's *Life*, separately reprinted a few weeks after its appearance as an introduction to the *Poems*. This reprint is unfortunately in many places corrupt.

<sup>1</sup> On the blank front page of MS. 8, beside the fragment, are the words: 'A peice of the Original letter of which this is a Copy'. Also pinned to MS. 8 and, like the manuscript itself, numbered '8' in red ink, is a piece of paper,  $5\frac{1}{2} \times 4$  in., evidently torn from a letter to Pope, with the following address in a flowery hand, not Parnell's: 'To M<sup>r</sup> Pope at | Buttons Coffee House | Overagainst Toms | Coventgarden.' It is not clear why this should be attached to MS. 8 or why it is similarly numbered.



## MACAULAY AND CROKER: THE REVIEW OF CROKER'S BOSWELL

By E. S. DE BEER

MACAULAY's treatment of Johnson and of Boswell in his review of Croker's edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* and in his article on Johnson in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* has aroused a great deal of controversy. Johnsonian and Boswellian scholars have objected to it, mainly on literary and biographical (or historical) grounds; except in so far as Macaulay's range of sympathies is involved there has been little question of his moral character. On the other hand, his treatment of Croker in the review has led to an ugly accusation, that Macaulay, having been worsted by Croker in debate in the House of Commons, avenged himself by a violent and unjustifiable attack on Croker's work as a man of letters. It is with this accusation, and more generally with Macaulay's attitude towards Croker and criticism of his work in the edition, that this article is concerned.

While a general accusation of undue political bias in the review was apparently made when it first appeared<sup>1</sup> and was no doubt commonly repeated, the particular accusation, that Macaulay was seeking revenge, seems to have been made in print first by Gladstone in the *Quarterly Review* for July 1876, in a review of Trevelyan's *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*:

There is . . . a parliamentary tradition sufficiently well established that Croker assailed, and assailed on the instant, some of Macaulay's celebrated speeches on Reform with signal talent, and with no inconsiderable effect. But he [i.e. Macaulay] never mentions Croker except with an aversion which may be partially understood, and also with a contempt which it is not so easy to account for. It is common to misunderstand the acts of an adversary, and even to depreciate his motives; but Macaulay cannot even acknowledge the strength of his arm. It is yet more to be lamented that, in this instance, he carried the passions of politics into the Elysian fields of literature; and that the scales in which he tried the merits of Croker's edition of 'Boswell' seem to have been weighted, on the descending side, with his recollections of parliamentary collision.<sup>2</sup>

A more general vindication of Croker against the statements about him in

<sup>1</sup> Jennings (see below) quotes *The Spectator* of September 1831, a questionable date: ii. 48-49. The review appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, liv (Aug.-Dec. 1831), 1-38, and was included in Macaulay's *Critical and Historical Essays*.

<sup>2</sup> *Quarterly Review*, cxlii (July 1876), 22-23, reprinted in Gladstone, *Gleanings of Past Years*, 1843-78, ii (1879), 297-8.

Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay* is provided in another article in the same issue of the *Quarterly Review*. In it the writer states that

there is clear evidence from Macaulay's own letters that it was because he writhed under the sting of Croker's successful replies in their parliamentary battles that he became the assailant in the field of literature.

A 'memorable encounter' on 20 September 1831 is described at some length.<sup>1</sup>

The best rendering of the charge against Macaulay is probably that provided by Croker's principal biographer, Louis J. Jennings. Jennings quotes Macaulay's statement that Croker's edition of Boswell is worthless,<sup>2</sup> and continues:

To any one who has read Mr. Croker's 'Boswell', or who has even taken the trouble to look through the notes, this judgment will appear so unfair and so unreasonable that a suspicion must inevitably be engendered that it was not arrived at by the legitimate exercise of the critical faculty, but must have been prompted by some personal and unworthy motive. The existence of such a motive was well understood at the time the onslaughts were made, and more recently it has been laid bare to the world by the publication of Macaulay's own 'Memoirs and Letters'. The attack defeated itself by its very violence, and therefore it did the book no harm whatever. Between forty and fifty thousand copies have been sold, although Macaulay boasted with great glee that he had 'smashed' it. . . .

The edition of 'Boswell' was not published until 1831. For some months previously in the House of Commons there had been sharp encounters between Croker and Macaulay in the debates on Reform. The two men, as it has been pointed out,<sup>3</sup> were to some extent 'pitted' against each other, and more than once Mr. Croker gained a marked and telling advantage over his antagonist. He had greater felicity in ready reply than Macaulay, and on more than one occasion he utterly demolished an elaborately prepared and showy, but unsubstantial, speech of the 'brilliant essayist.' Macaulay, as it clearly appears from his own letters, was irritated beyond measure by Croker; he grew to 'detest' him. Then he began casting about for some means of revenge. This would seem incredible if he had not, almost in so many words, revealed the secret. In July, 1831, he thus wrote: 'That impudent, leering Croker congratulated the House on the proof which I had given of my readiness. He was afraid, he said, that I had been silent so long on account of the many allusions which had been made to Calne. Now that I had risen again he hoped that they should hear me often. *See whether I do not dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the Blue and Yellow.* I detest him more than cold boiled veal.'<sup>4</sup> From that time

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Review*, cxlii. 108-12. The date of the encounter is given here as 22 September. The same inaccuracy occurs in *D.N.B.* and in Mr. Brightfield's *Croker*.

<sup>2</sup> From the review of Mme D'Arblay's *Diary* (1843).

<sup>3</sup> *Quarterly Review*, July, 1876, p. 108 [Jennings's citation].

<sup>4</sup> Trevelyan's 'Macaulay', i, p. 239. [In edition cited below (1908, reprinted 1923), i. 173; the italics are due to Jennings. Macaulay is writing to his sister.]

forth he waited impatiently for his opportunity to settle his account with Mr. Croker.

In the previous month of March he had been looking out eagerly for the publication of the 'Boswell'. 'I will certainly review Croker's 'Boswell' when it comes out,' he wrote to Mr. Napier.<sup>1</sup> He was on the watch for it, not with the object of doing justice to the book, but of 'dusting the jacket' of the author. . . .<sup>2</sup>

Sir Theodore Martin followed this account fairly closely in his article on Croker in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (the volume was published in 1888), but reintroduces the clash in debate which occurred on 20 September 1831. He describes how Croker answered Macaulay on that day, and continues:

This was not the first discomfiture in the House of Commons which Macaulay had sustained at Croker's hands. In several previous encounters he had come badly off. These defeats rankled, and it is now very obvious from Macaulay's published correspondence that something more than this professed reverence for his author had prompted him to attack Croker's elaborate edition of Boswell's 'Life of Johnson' in a recent number of the 'Edinburgh' with an asperity of which there are happily few examples in recent literary history.

Croker's most-recent biographer, Mr. Myron F. Brightfield, has little to add to Jennings, but is precise. The edition of Boswell appeared in the middle of June 1831.

More eager than any bookseller for the appearance of this work was T. B. Macaulay, who was smarting at this time from wounds received from Croker in the Reform debates.

The review approaches 'fairly closely the limits of hypocrisy and spite'.<sup>3</sup>

These four writers all concur in the accusation that in the review Macaulay was seeking revenge for humiliations inflicted on him in debate. If the accusation were proved Macaulay would have been a low cad. There are strong general reasons why it should never have been made; if they were to be disregarded, the historical evidence for it ought to have been examined.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Napier's Correspondence', p. 110. [*Selection from the Correspondence of the late Macvey Napier, Esq.*, edited by Macvey Napier (jnr.), 1879. The italics are due to Jennings.]

<sup>2</sup> *The Croker Papers*, edited by L. J. Jennings (1884), ii. 46-49. The passage includes a defence of Croker's edition of Boswell.

<sup>3</sup> *John Wilson Croker* (Berkeley, California, 1940), p. 299.

<sup>4</sup> There are for the period concerned good, though not first-rate, reports of the Commons' debates; in addition to *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates* and *The Mirror of Parliament* (for some debates I think the one repeats the other), there are, I believe, several sets of newspaper reports (I have consulted only those in *The Times*). Further there is an excellent chronicler in Charles Greville, and there are several smaller diaries and memoirs. In view of this material we can be certain that no important passage in the House of Commons at this time has been completely lost or unduly minimized.

Croker was a member of the House of Commons almost continuously from 1807 until the dissolution of Parliament at the end of 1832. Macaulay was first returned on 15 February 1830; this was for Lord Lansdowne's pocket borough of Calne, which he continued to represent until the end of 1832. He spoke infrequently, generally making prepared speeches and only rarely intervening in debate. He and Croker first came into direct conflict in the House on 23 November 1830. Croker censured Brougham, who had recently gone into the House of Lords as Lord Chancellor, for inconsistency. There was some debate; Macaulay joined in, declaring that, had Brougham been present, Croker would not have dared to speak as he had done; this so vigorously, that the Speaker called him to order.<sup>1</sup> Croker appears to have made a tame response. Their next encounter took place in March 1831. On 2 March Macaulay delivered his first speech on Reform, a speech which won the plaudits of the House. Croker joined in the debate on 4 March; his speech, which was short, contained a complimentary allusion to Macaulay; in it he attacked the preferential treatment given to Calne in the Reform Bill (the first). Macaulay did not speak again until July.

On 8 March he wrote to Macvey Napier, the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, that he would review Croker's *Boswell* when it appeared.<sup>2</sup> He received his review copy shortly before 29 June,<sup>3</sup> when he wrote to his sister:

I am to review Croker's edition of Bozzy. It is wretchedly ill done. The notes are poorly written, and shamefully inaccurate. There is, however, much curious information in it. The whole of the Tour to the Hebrides is incorporated with the Life. So are most of Mrs. Thrale's anecdotes, and much of Sir John Hawkins's lumbering book. . . . There is a most laughable sketch of Bozzy, taken by Sir T. Lawrence when young. I never saw a character so thoroughly hit off. . . . The lady whom Johnson abused for flattering him was certainly, according to Croker, Hannah More. Another ill-natured sentence about a Bath lady whom Johnson called 'empty-headed' is also applied to your godmother.<sup>4</sup>

On 5 July he made a second important speech on Reform. Croker did not take part in this debate; he spoke frequently, however, on the details of the bill when it was in committee, and towards the end of the month had much to say about Calne. On 3 August Macaulay intervened in a debate in committee on the bill. Croker spoke later in the debate; he dealt rather well

<sup>1</sup> See below, p. 393, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 390. The context suggests that Macaulay was responding to an invitation or request.

<sup>3</sup> The book is advertised as 'just published' in *The Times* of 23 June (p. 7f.).

<sup>4</sup> Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, enlarged and complete edition (1908), i. 165.

with part of Macaulay's speech, but, so far as the available reports show, what he said was unimportant. It was apparently some days after this that Macaulay wrote to his sister about his hatred of Croker and about dusting his jacket.<sup>1</sup>

On 7 September Macaulay sent to Napier the first part of the review:

I send the first part separately, because it is absolutely necessary that I should see the proofs of it. It is an exposure of Croker's monstrous blunders; and we must not, in censuring his inaccuracy, be ourselves inaccurate.<sup>2</sup>

Two days later, he wrote to his sister:

I have, though I say it who should not say it, beaten Croker black and blue. Impudent as he is, I think he must be ashamed of the pickle in which I leave him.<sup>3</sup>

Eleven days later, on 20 September, Croker first replied in set form to a speech by Macaulay. Greville writes on 22 September:

The night before last Croker and Macaulay made two fine speeches on Reform; the former spoke for 2½ hours, and in a way he had never done before. Macaulay very brilliant.

Effective as was Croker's reply, it cannot be regarded as an unquestionable victory for him. On 24 September Greville continues:

Peel closed the debate on Thursday night [22 September] with a very fine speech, the best . . . he had ever made, not only on that subject, but on any other; he cut Macaulay to ribbands. Macaulay is very brilliant, but his speeches are harangues and never replies; whereas Peel's long experience and real talent for debate give him a great advantage in the power of reply, which he very eminently possesses.<sup>4</sup>

But, victory or not, the clash can scarcely have affected the review, which was published at Edinburgh and in London on 6 October.<sup>5</sup> In one of three later encounters Croker apparently had the best of the argument; in another

<sup>1</sup> The letter quoted by Jennings; Trevelyan, i. 173. The letter is dated Saturday; the House of Commons was sitting, and Macaulay had left it while Sir Francis Burdett was speaking; and he mentions the August issue of *Blackwood's Magazine*. I have not noticed an advertisement for the last in *The Times*. The Commons sat on every Saturday from 30 July to 3 September. Burdett spoke on 30 July and 27 August, on both occasions very shortly. The reports in *Hansard* and *The Times* do not mention Croker's congratulating Macaulay; both are presumably condensed. I am unable to identify a passage in an undated letter of Macaulay's quoted by Trevelyan, i. 173 n.

<sup>2</sup> *Correspondence of Napier*, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Trevelyan, i. 177-8.

<sup>4</sup> C. C. F. Greville, *The Greville Memoirs*, ed. Lytton Strachey and R. Fulford (1938), ii. 200-1, 203. The debate finished at 5.30 a.m. on the Thursday morning.

<sup>5</sup> *The Times*, 6 October, p. 7b.

he exposed himself to a serious discomfiture.<sup>1</sup> While Macaulay had to be on guard against him, he had no reason to fear him.<sup>2</sup>

There was, in short, no clash between Croker and Macaulay in the House that the latter could regard as a humiliation for himself before he had made up his mind about the value of Croker's editorial work, and had stated his estimate of it. As Macaulay had no personal defeats in debate to avenge, the accusation that he attacked Croker's edition in revenge for defeats of the kind is without foundation.

Macaulay indeed hated Croker. Posterity has generally contrived to remember Croker for his merits and, with some resort to exculpation, to forget most of his defects. He was at his best as secretary to the Admiralty, as originator of the Athenæum, as a collector of French Revolution pamphlets, and in some part of his work as editor of Boswell. On the other hand, now that a full list of his contributions to the *Quarterly Review* is available,<sup>3</sup> he must rank as one of the most detestable of English men of letters.

He was a poor writer and in general a poor scholar; even if he had been better equipped, he was too much a partisan to produce much of value. He seems to have aimed at being an intermediary between the great Tory nobles and the leading statesmen of the party, but possessed neither the character nor the abilities to win high political office or respect. His close political associates were occasionally exasperated: thus about 1824 a letter from Wellington to Mrs. Charles Arbuthnot contained 'a long tirade about his vulgarity & impertinence, talking of *Mrs. Croker's brother as one of the aristocracy*'.<sup>4</sup> In 1825 Mrs. Arbuthnot writes that he 'talks incessantly &, with his usual presumption, today gave Sir Richard Strachan a lesson upon attacking batteries'.<sup>5</sup> In 1832 Arbuthnot describes him as 'the greatest bore and torment alive'.<sup>6</sup> In the House of Commons he was an assiduous speaker, but with a bad manner. Thus Mrs. Arbuthnot, writing on 23 October 1831 about the last four months:

In the course of these long debates, Mr. Croker was conspicuous for his eloquence, his research & the distinguished ability with which he shewed up

<sup>1</sup> Sir D. Le Marchant, *Memoir of John Charles Viscount Althorp, third Earl Spencer* (1876), pp. 382-3.

<sup>2</sup> Macaulay writes to Napier about the clash on 23 November 1830: 'You will see that I gave Croker a dressing the other night in Brougham's defence. I was in no good humour with B. But the insufferable impertinence and poltroonery of Croker exasperated me beyond all patience. I am thought to have had the best of the battle by our critics here': *Correspondence of Napier*, p. 98.

<sup>3</sup> Brightfield, *Croker*, pp. 453-9.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot*, ed. A. Aspinall (R. Hist. Soc., Camden 3rd ser., lxxv (1941)), p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal of Mrs. Arbuthnot*, ed. F. Bamford and the Duke of Wellington (1950), i. 431-2.

<sup>6</sup> *Correspondence*, p. 148 n.



the glaring inconsistencies & gross injustice of the Bill. If he had a little more tact & more urbanity, he might be anything; but every body in the House dislikes him, & it is a pity if [for ?] he is an excellent good natured man & full of talent.<sup>1</sup>

The more neutral Greville writes on 29 February 1832:

My old aversion for the High Tories returns when I see their conduct on this occasion. The obstinacy of the Duke, the selfishness of Peel, the pert vulgarity of Croker, and the incapacity of the rest are set in constant juxtaposition with the goodness of the cause which they are now defending, but which they will mar by their way of defending it.<sup>2</sup>

Macaulay's hatred of Croker was probably not political in origin. Macaulay's father, Zachary Macaulay, had been the victim of a scurrilous attack by Theodore Hook in *John Bull*; Macaulay perhaps felt that Croker, as Hook's protector,<sup>3</sup> had something to answer for. Macaulay disliked 'attacks on female character';<sup>4</sup> the *Quarterly Review* had occasionally indulged in them and, although he could not know Croker's exact share in them, Croker was so closely associated with the periodical as to bear some responsibility for them. Croker, when he first encountered Macaulay in person, felt some antipathy: 'I disliked him at first sight before I ever heard him open his mouth; his very person and countenance displeased me.'<sup>5</sup> This may have shown too strongly. Although in political issues

<sup>1</sup> *Journal*, ii. 430.

<sup>2</sup> *The Greville Memoirs*, ii. 265. If my remarks about Croker seem unfair, here is what Greville says about him at the time of his death in 1857: 'He continued till the last year or two to exhale his bitterness and spite in the columns of the "Quarterly Review", but at last the Editor (who had long been sick of him) contrived to get rid of him . . . he certainly occupied a high place among the second-rate men of his time; he had very considerable talents, great industry, with much information and a retentive memory. He spoke in Parliament with considerable force, and in society his long acquaintance with the world and with public affairs, and his stores of general knowledge made him entertaining, though he was too overbearing to be agreeable', and Greville concludes with Macaulay's antipathy: *Memoirs*, vii. 298.

I have avoided the literary portraits of Croker by Lady Morgan, Disraeli, and Thackeray; I have also paid as little attention as possible to Macaulay's remarks about him; to Harriet Martineau's; and so on. These materials cannot be dismissed as mere abuse, and it is possible that an examination of Croker's relations with the third Marquis of Hertford would produce some very unpleasant passages. Mr. Brightfield's book, while extremely eulogistic, is sometimes very candid; in particular he prints an important letter of Macaulay's, 3 January 1843 (pp. 132-4, 359), which indicates the more important charges against Croker.

<sup>3</sup> Brightfield, pp. 248-54.

<sup>4</sup> *Correspondence of Napier*, pp. 83-84, where Macaulay mentions *John Bull*.

<sup>5</sup> Croker to J. G. Lockhart, January 1849, in Brightfield, p. 369. Croker goes on to say: 'But after we had been pitted (I will not venture to say matched) against each other in Parliament, I can honestly say that my former feelings were, if not lost, at least overpowered, by my sense of the brilliancy of his talents'. So far as I am aware Croker never suggested that Macaulay was seeking revenge in the review of Boswell.



Macaulay was a strong Whig partisan, his opinions about persons were influenced by moral and intellectual considerations;<sup>1</sup> but he could not be immune from party feeling, which was, as he himself said, 'fearfully violent' in July;<sup>2</sup> and in Croker's conduct as a member could find no redeeming features to counterbalance his political views or his general conduct; so much so that he disliked Croker's praise.<sup>3</sup> Croker's frequent remarks about the treatment of Calne in the first and second Reform Bills may have aroused some animosity; but Calne was fair game as a constitutional issue, and Croker did not use it to attack Macaulay.<sup>4</sup>

In 1831 Macaulay would have described Croker, more or less, as mean, cowardly, spiteful, and cruel, and would have cited instances for each charge. When he was reviewing the *Boswell* it is unlikely that he allowed his feelings to dictate his opinions; but he had no reason to spare Croker any of the book's defects; finding the book bad, he was human enough to be pleased at finding it very bad indeed.

Macaulay's hatred of Croker probably affected the tone, but not the matter of the review. The book is bad, he declares, because the historical and biographical notes are unreliable (he instances a dozen that can be readily tested); insufficient knowledge of Greek and Latin has led to errors in other notes (specimens are given); many notes are needless or worthless comments; there is some half-hearted and needless expurgation of Boswell's text of the *Life of Johnson*; and, by interpolating in the *Life* materials from other sources, Croker has disfigured a masterpiece.

Croker prepared answers to the particular charges of error in the historical notes; these were published in the November issue of *Blackwood's Magazine* and as a pamphlet.<sup>5</sup> Macaulay decided that the answers were not worth refuting.<sup>6</sup> Later editors have agreed with Macaulay in almost all the points at issue, but in some cases the decision is less obvious than Macaulay makes it appear to be. Macaulay's general charge, based on the specimens

<sup>1</sup> Thus when the Reform debates were at their bitterest he formed an enduring friendship with the Tory Lord Mahon (later the fifth Earl Stanhope): Trevelyan, i. 150, 169, 193 n., &c.; *Correspondence of Napier*, p. 130. Mahon was the first Tory to answer Macaulay's first speech on Reform, on 2 March 1831.

<sup>2</sup> Trevelyan, i. 169.

<sup>3</sup> Macaulay's letter to his sister, above, p. 389; see also Trevelyan, i. 173 n.

<sup>4</sup> I have noticed Croker speaking about Calne on 19, 26, and 28 July, and 2 August 1831 (*Hansard*, 3rd ser., v. 57-61, 354-7, 360, 469, 488, 621, 623-4). I cannot detect any allusions to Macaulay in these reports. Other members of the opposition also raised the issue. Calne was disfranchised in the third Reform Bill. Macaulay had nothing personally to fear from its disfranchisement; he had so distinguished himself that he could be certain of being returned for one of the new constituencies (he was returned by Leeds in the first Reformed Parliament).

<sup>5</sup> Brightfield, p. 301; see also p. 370.

<sup>6</sup> *Correspondence of Napier*, pp. 120, 121.

which he gives, that Croker 'is entitled to no confidence whatever' in the historical notes, is endorsed by Birkbeck Hill.<sup>1</sup>

Croker had anticipated the objection to the interpolations in the *Life*. If he had 'failed in his attempt to improve the original work', no great harm had been done. The additions were 'carefully discriminated, and hardly a syllable of Mr. Boswell's text or of the notes in Mr. Malone's editions' was omitted. 'So that the worst that can happen is that all the present editor has contributed may, if the reader so pleases, be rejected as *surplusage*.'<sup>2</sup> This claim does not stand testing: even a good Boswellian could not recover the text as Boswell wrote it; for an ordinary reader much of the pleasure to be derived from Boswell would be lost in the irritation arising from the difficulty of finding his text.<sup>3</sup>

There is one more serious objection to Macaulay's treatment of the edition. Croker brought together and first published much valuable material which, but for his exertions, might well have been lost for ever; he identified many of the persons described anonymously by Boswell. Macaulay's letter to his sister when he received the book shows that he was to some extent aware of this.<sup>4</sup> While his silence about these matters in the review may be attributed in part to hatred or to a desire for triumph, there was also the practical consideration, that if the review contained a line of praise for any feature in the edition, the publisher would use it in advertising the book; the rest of the review would be ignored. In a later part of the review Macaulay gives the greatest possible praise to Boswell's *Life*; if it was to be read, readers were to read what Boswell wrote as he wrote it, and not a mangled version of it. Croker's reputation as a literary scholar was high enough to shield the edition from anything less than complete condemnation. It was essential to put readers on their guard against it.

The effect of the review was greater than Macaulay probably expected. Although on 7 October, the day after it appeared, Croker advised John Murray, the publisher of the book, to take no notice of it,<sup>5</sup> ten days later Macaulay wrote to a friend that his 'article on Croker' had 'smashed his book'; 'John Murray says that it is a damned nuisance'.<sup>6</sup> A favourable

<sup>1</sup> Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. G. Birkbeck Hill, revised by L. F. Powell (Oxford, 1934-50), i. xli.

<sup>2</sup> Preface, i. xxiii.

<sup>3</sup> The defects inherent in Croker's plan were increased by careless printing. Macaulay also complains of the damage done to Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes*. The defence put forward by some later scholars, that Croker has provided a kind of *clavis Johnsoniana*, a chronological sequence of all the known events in Johnson's life, seems to me irrelevant for an edition of Boswell intended for all classes of readers.

<sup>4</sup> Above, p. 391.

<sup>5</sup> Brightfield, p. 300. In 1849 Croker wrote that he never 'cared a fig about it': *ibid.*, p. 370. This is incredible; on the other hand Greville's statement in 1857, that the review 'almost broke Croker's heart' (*Memoirs*, vii. 298), seems exaggerated.

<sup>6</sup> Trevelyan, i. 180.

review had recently appeared in the *Westminster Review*; neither that, nor a eulogy by Lockhart in the *Quarterly Review* for November, nor the refutation of Macaulay's charges in *Blackwood's Magazine*, were of any avail. The book was apparently withdrawn.

That monstrous medley reached no second edition. In its new form all the worst excrescences had been cleared away, and though what was left was not Boswell, still less was it unchastened Croker.<sup>1</sup>

It was this version, revised by John Wright, and first published in 1835, that sold as Croker's vindicators boast. Macaulay's praise of the *Life* was a factor in the demand for it;<sup>2</sup> the notoriety given to it by the review may, paradoxically, have contributed to the success of the later version.

<sup>1</sup> Birkbeck Hill, preface, as cited above.

<sup>2</sup> The passage about Eclipse is quoted in the opinions about Boswell's *Life* prefixed to the edition.

## NOTES

### DRYDEN'S BALAAM WELL HUNG?

DRYDEN scholars have never been satisfied with Tonson's identification of the 'well-hung Balaam' as the Earl of Huntingdon.<sup>1</sup> It is hard to believe that Dryden in his gallery of opponents obnoxious to the Court commemorates a repentant Whig turned Tory: his Balaam is still an objectionable person and one of the Whig 'lords'.

A more likely identification is possible. Let us accept Balaam—who in the Old Testament obeys God's commands sullenly and whom St. Peter refers to as a beguiling prophet that 'loved the wages of unrighteousness' (2 Peter ii, esp. 10-16)—as an ambivalent, if not outright wicked, character. Let us accept 'well-hung' to mean in particular fluent or voluble<sup>2</sup> and in general apt, well poised, or well put together<sup>3</sup> (and the acceptance of these meanings does not necessarily rule out the play on the coarse meaning of the expression). And let us note that the prevailing raillery of the poem gives the commendatory connotations of 'well-hung' an ironic twist. Now there appears in a letter written about a month after the publication of *Absalom and Achitophel* a reference to a contemporary politician who fits the picture. Its sender and receiver unspecified, the letter in part runs thus:

London, Dec. 21 [1681]. . . . In Dryden's poem, called Absolon and Architophel, are represented the lively characters of the Duke of Monmouth and Shaftsbury, also Howard, Sir William Jones, Bethel, Winnington, and most of that party, under Jewish names, together with the Doctor of Salamanca, as Corah. After which are nobly described the Duke of Ormond, Halifax, Hide, Seymour, and most of the loyal party. Dryden has already been presented with 100 l.<sup>4</sup>

The first sentence accounts properly for five of the ten opposition charac-

<sup>1</sup> *Absalom and Achitophel*, l. 574. Tonson's identification is in the 1716 key. For the scholarly commentary see *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury (Edinburgh and London, 1882-93), ix. 264 n.; *The Poetical Works of Dryden*, ed. G. R. Noyes (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), p. 961; E. S. de Beer, 'Absalom and Achitophel: Literary and Historical Notes', *R.E.S.*, xvii (1941), 307-8; J. Kinsley, 'Historical Allusions in *Absalom and Achitophel*', *R.E.S.* n.s. vi (1955), 292-3; E. S. de Beer in *R.E.S.* n.s. vii (1956), 410-11, 414.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Firth points to the following two lines in Oldham's *A Satyr, In Imitation of the Third of Juvenal*. Written in May, 1682: 'Flippant of talk, and voluble of Tongue, / With words at will, no Lawyer better hung. . . .'

<sup>3</sup> See *O.E.D.*, under *Hung*, 1.

<sup>4</sup> This letter is listed as No. 19 in 'A Volume of letters and papers connected with the plot of Titus Oates', included in 'The Manuscripts Belonging to Sir N. W. Throckmorton, Bart., Kept at Buckland House', *Historical Manuscripts Commission Tenth Report*, Appendix, Part IV. *The Manuscripts of The Earl of Westmorland . . . and Others* (London, 1885), pp. 174-5.

ters in *Absalom and Achitophel*: Absalom-Monmouth, Achitophel-Shaftesbury, Jonas-Jones, Shimei-Bethel, and Corah-Oates. Zimri, i.e. the Duke of Buckingham, and Issachar, i.e. Thomas Thinne, were so well recognized then that no more need be said of them. If we allow Howard to be linked according to tradition with Nadab, Winnington must in the letter-writer's mind be associated with either Balaam or Caleb. Winnington seems to me to fit Balaam well.

To the Court during the years 1678-81 Sir Francis Winnington (1634-1700) could indeed appear as a Balaam-like figure—compounded of dubious good and of suspected and, by 1681, proven bad elements—and as a voluble leader of the Whig Exclusionists. Until 1678 he had impressed the Court as an exceedingly able lawyer. Rising rapidly in the profession, he was engaged by Prince Rupert as standing counsel, in 1672 was knighted and created king's counsel and attorney-general to the Duke of York, in 1674 was made solicitor-general, and in 1676/7, by Charles II's command, was returned to parliament for the borough of Windsor. But in 1678 he lost all the favour of the Court by supporting the Exclusion Bill, seconding it along with Capel and Montague. Almost at once, in January 1678/9, he lost the office of solicitor-general and, at the dissolution of parliament in the same month, his seat at Windsor. (Thereafter he represented Worcester in the three parliaments of Feb. 1678/9, Sept. 1679, and Mar. 1680/1.)<sup>1</sup>

To King and Court, who till 1678 had obviously prized him, he became after that date a thorn in the flesh. To the realistic Court observers who had to provide the Duke of Ormond, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with factual reports, Winnington was one of 'the principal managers' of the Whig majority in the House of Commons. He championed the right of petition and as a militant Protestant attacked the suppression of anti-Popish writings. With a fury that his own party could not stem, he denounced as unforgivable and meaningless lenience the bill of banishment directed by the House of Lords against Danby. Even Burnet observed that Winnington 'was so blown up with popularity, and so much provoked by being turned out of the place of solicitor general, that he could not be prevailed on'. And outside parliament he struck the Court as being a fomenter of riots and an exponent of 'a free state and no other government'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *D.N.B.*; Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, ed. O. Airy (Oxford, 1900), ii. 257; Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714* (Oxford, 1857), i. 6-7; and A. Browning, *Thomas Osborne Earl of Danby* (Glasgow, 1944), i. 313.

<sup>2</sup> See *H.M.C., Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, K.P.*, n.s. v. 561, 518; Leopold von Ranke, *A History of England Principally in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1875), iv. 109; Burnet, ed. Airy, ii. 207-8 (Burnet, ii. 183-4, considered Winnington 'rather bold and ready than able'); and *Cal. State Papers, Domestic. September 1st, 1680, to December 31st, 1681*, pp. 175 and 232.

Winnington's eloquence drew the respect of all sides, particularly after 1678. Sir Robert Southwell, writing to the Duke of Ormond, reluctantly admired the 'great remarks by Sir Francis Winnington' which won 'high applause'; Col. Edward Cooke reported to Ormond that at the trial of Lord Stafford 'Winnington most eloquently aggravated the circumstances. . .'; the new members in the parliament of 1680, generally impatient with the old ones, listened with respect to the veteran Winnington; Lord Somers was his pupil in law; Evelyn called him 'a famous Pleader'; Garth, in the *Dispensary*, felt moved to write 'But how at church and bar all gape and stretch/If Winnington plead, or South or Only preach. . .'; and Roger North noted his mannerisms:

. . . At length Sir *Fra. W—n* stood up and, continually nodding, as his Way was [Is this what Dryden caught in 'well-hung'?], said, *since these Gentlemen are so much for hearing, though the Person named was convict by Mr. Attorney's express Discovery at the Bar, by his Consent* (and then he lifted up his Voice) *the Party should be heard, and therefore he moved* (still louder[r] and louder) *that the House might impeach him of high Crimes and Misdemeanors. . .*<sup>1</sup>

His speeches, as reported in Cobbett, reveal his eloquence at the same time as they show the stand which after 1678 lost him the favour of the Court. He spoke on all the main issues, most often, between 1678 and 1681, on Exclusion. As a Protestant speaking (he felt) for the whole land and for posterity, he sought to sustain the main line of Protestant-Exclusionist opinion, and to get decisive legislation, modified, it can be noticed, by a personal regard for the Duke of York.<sup>2</sup>

Is Sir Francis Winnington Dryden's 'well-hung Balaam'? Certainly, as a foremost representative of the opposition,<sup>3</sup> he seems to me an excellent candidate. In the eyes of the King and the Court he could be a Balaam—ambivalent and increasingly obnoxious in the years 1678 to 1681. His

<sup>1</sup> *Ormonde MSS.*, iv. 561, v. 467, 512; *D.N.B.*; Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. de Beer (Oxford, 1955), iv. 227 (entry for 2 Dec. 1680, about the trial of Stafford); Garth in *The Works of the Most Celebrated Minor Poets* (London, 1751), i. 214; and Roger North, *Examen . . .* (London, 1740), p. 553. His fame as a great lawyer persisted into the eighteenth century. For example, Arthur Onslow concluded that 'he was certainly a man of parts, as appears in all his parliamentary performances in these times' (Burnet, ii. 183 n.); and William Seward at the end of the century regarded him as a lawyer in great practice (*Anecdotes of Some Distinguished Persons*, referred to in H. C. Foxcroft, *The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart.* (London, 1898), i. 225 n.).

<sup>2</sup> See Cobbett's *Parliamentary History of England* (London, 1808), iv. 848, 850, 913, 922, 936-7, 944-5, 1028-9, 1065-6, 1133-4, 1142, 1143, 1146, 1168-70, 1173-4, 1178, 1201-2, 1210-11, 1225-6, 1243, 1248-9, 1264, 1264-5, 1267, 1287-9, 1307-8, 1310, 1314, 1327-8, 1333-4.

<sup>3</sup> He was consistently linked in observers' minds with the front-rank leaders of the opposition. See, e.g., *Ormonde MSS.*, iv. 561, v. 467, 518, 561; *Cal. State Papers, Domestic, September 1st, 1680 to December 31st, 1681*, pp. 232, 660; Burnet, ii. 207-8, 257; Luttrell, i. 79-80; and Foxcroft, *Savile*, i. 259.

famed eloquence turns into mere fluency and volubility at Dryden's ironic touch in 'well-hung'. Perhaps, too, his oratorical tactic in parliamentary debate of relating his pleas for Exclusion to the safety of his wife and children draws Dryden's gibe in 'kind husbands' (l. 572). And perhaps, above all, Dryden was jeering at a Winnington who saw himself as Balaam, called by Balak (Charles II) to curse his enemies, but blessing them three times (Numbers xxiv. 11): 'I thought to promote thee unto great honour; but, lo, the Lord hath kept thee back from honour.'

WALLACE MAURER

### A LETTER OF GIBBON TO ADAM SMITH

IN Miss J. E. Norton's edition of *The Letters of Edward Gibbon* (London and New York, 1956) the letter of Gibbon to Adam Smith (vol. ii, no. 402, 'Wed. 26/11/77') is indicated only by a few lines taken from a catalogue of Maggs Bros., Ltd.—No. 433 (1922), item 3261—with a note saying that 'the present whereabouts of the original is unknown'. The original is to be found in the Honeyman Collection of the Lehigh University Library, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. I quote it complete, with permission, as follows:

Dear Sir

Among the strange reports, which are every day circulated in this wide town, I heard one to-day so very extraordinary, that I know not how to give credit to it. I was informed that a place of Commissioner of the Customs in Scotland had been given to a Philosopher who for his own glory and for the benefit of mankind had enlightened the world by the most profound and systematic treatise on the great objects of trade and revenue which had ever been published in any age or in any Country. But as I was told at the same time that this Philosopher was my particular friend, I found myself very forcibly inclined to believe, what I most sincerely wished and desired.

After a very pleasant summer passed in Paris where I often heard your name, and saw several of your friends particularly the Dutchess Danville, and the Countess de Boufflers, I returned to England about the beginning of this Month. If I was guilty of any intemperance I have been punished by a very severe fit of the Gout, from which I am now recovering to mix again in the more tumultuous but perhaps less pleasing Society of London. If your new dignity should [not] allow you to make us a regular visit every spring or summer I am afraid I shall be selfish enough to murmur at your promotion. In case you should be at Edinburgh, I must trouble you with my Compliments to Dr Robertson: in a post or two I hope to satisfy him by what a strange concurrence of accidents I have appeared so very careless. Beauclerc, who is playing at Whisk, desires me to



assure you that he is warmly interested in whatever may be agreeable or advantageous to you.

I am Dear Sir with the highest regard  
most sincerely yours  
E. Gibbon.

Almacks: Nov. the 26th 1777.

Of the two Frenchwomen referred to, the first is Marie-Louise-Nicole-Elisabeth, Duchesse d'Anville (1716-94), a granddaughter of La Rochefoucauld of the *Maximes*, and a faithful friend of Turgot. The second is Marie-Charlotte-Hippolyte, Comtesse de Boufflers-Rouvrel (1724-c. 1800); she presided, as mistress of the Prince de Conti, over the salons of the Temple, and was the friend and correspondent of Hume and Rousseau. To many she was 'la Minerve savante'; to Mme du Deffand she was irreverently 'l'idole du temple'. Dr. Robertson and Topham Beauclerk are mentioned in other letters and are duly identified in the Norton edition. The frenchified spellings here are pure Gibbon.

ERNEST DILWORTH

## REVIEWS

**Textus Roffensis.** Rochester Cathedral Library Manuscript A. 3. 5 Part I, edited by PETER SAWYER. Pp. 24 + i<sup>r</sup>-iii<sup>v</sup> + 1<sup>r</sup>-118<sup>v</sup> (Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 7). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger; London: Allen and Unwin, 1957. £26.

*Textus Roffensis* is one of the most important sources for Anglo-Saxon studies. It is a Rochester manuscript of the early twelfth century and it is still preserved in Rochester Cathedral Library. It consists of two parts, originally separate volumes, but written by the same scribe and now bound together in a single volume. The first part (ff. 1-118) contains the best extant collection of Old English laws, and the second part (ff. 119-235) is essentially a chartulary of Rochester Cathedral Priory, perhaps the most reliable of our chartularies, as far as Old English material is concerned, and one that preserves much valuable and otherwise unrecorded information about Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England. It is the first part only that is reproduced here.

In his introduction to this edition Mr. Peter Sawyer discusses the arrangement of the manuscript, the leaves and their rulings, alterations and additions to the text, the date of the manuscript, its sources, and its history. He also provides a useful calendar of contents which includes references 'to the best printed edition and, if there is one, to an edition with a modern English translation'.

He notes that there is an *ex libris* inscription at the foot of f. 1, as is usual in Rochester books, and from the fact that there is no similar inscription on f. 119 he concludes, reasonably, that the two parts of *Textus Roffensis* were already bound together as a single volume by the early fourteenth century, when these *ex libris* inscriptions were added to books at Rochester. The volume has been rebound more than once since that time, of course, most recently in 1937.

He also concludes that the original order of the gatherings has been disturbed and he shows how it may be restored. Gatherings 7-9 (ff. 58-97), for example, originally preceded gatherings 1-4 (ff. 1-39). The evidence is convincing as demonstrating the order in which the folios were written, but it does not necessarily follow, as Mr. Sawyer holds, that the book was 'originally intended' to begin with the *Instituta Cnuti* (ff. 58-60) and not with the laws of the early Kentish kings (ff. 1 ff.) as it does now. The present arrangement of the gatherings obviously took place before the early fourteenth century, when the *ex libris* inscription was added to f. 1; but it may also have been the original intention that the Kentish laws should appear at the beginning of the book, i.e. it may be that the present position of ff. 1-39 is that originally intended by the scribe and by the person who (if he was other than the scribe himself) first put the gatherings together as a book. In ff. 1-37, but not in later folios, there are certain orthographic peculiarities, and certain alterations of a linguistic character subsequently introduced by the scribe himself, and it may be that these support this view.

The date of the manuscript is generally given as 'early twelfth century, after 1122'. It was completed after 20 October 1122, probably very soon after,

perhaps before 18 February 1123. But among the sources used by the scribe was a manuscript of the early eleventh century, possibly from Canterbury. Mr. Sawyer makes these points clear. The history of the manuscript is fascinating: it was used by William Lambard, Francis Tate, Sir Edward Dering, Sir Roger Twysden, John Johnson, David Wilkins, Benjamin Thorpe, F. L. Attenborough, Miss A. J. Robertson, and many others, and, as Liebermann remarks, 'the history of the *Textus Roffensis* is almost the history of Anglo-Saxon studies in general'. It is unfortunate that Mr. Sawyer was unable to extend this section of his introduction. It is unfortunate, too, that he was unable to give a full bibliography for each item in the manuscript. These are matters for regret, however, not for criticism: Mr. Sawyer is bound by the limits of space available and presumably by the agreed scope of introductions to facsimiles in this series; and reviewers are always ready to demand more than what they are offered. Regrets such as these, therefore, are complimentary.

Most of the items in this collection of legal texts are already well known to students in the various printed editions of them, but it is an inestimable boon at last to have available a facsimile of a manuscript which is normally difficult of access. Scholars will be deeply grateful to Mr. Sawyer, to Dr. Bertram Colgrave, and to the Danish publishers of this extremely valuable series.

F. T. WAINWRIGHT

***The Parlement of Foules. An Interpretation.*** By J. A. W. BENNETT. Pp. x+218. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. 30s. net.

*The Parlement of Foules* is an extraordinarily rich work, and also in some ways a puzzling one. Hardly a year has gone by recently without an attempt to provide an interpretation. Dr. Bennett's monograph is the fullest, most balanced, and most valuable of interpretations. To read it is to be made aware, once again, of the extraordinary range of Chaucer's resources, of his wonderful power of gathering together a great variety of 'authority and experience', of his continued pondering of the nature of human experience, and of the yeast-like working of his humour. Dr. Bennett's book is civilized and learned, judicious and well written. In brief space it gives an admirable demonstration (and if it is complex, so is the subject) of the European quality, the English character, the artistic power of one of our greatest poets. Dr. Bennett brings to the poem an especially wide acquaintance with the mind and conventions of European literature which opens new windows on the poem, and destroys some older false lights; the book's main weakness, a defect of one of its prime virtues, lies in the very copiousness of allusion and quotation, which sometimes makes it difficult to see the wood for the trees.

The chief contributions of the book are: to vivify by quotation and commentary the dull references to which an annotated edition is inevitably restricted, so as to enable us to grasp more fully Chaucer's aims and methods; to restore the first half of the poem, so frequently neglected, to a proper place in our consideration and enjoyment; and more specifically, to suggest that the underlying theme

of the poem arises out of that philosophical 'principle of plenitude' by which men in the Middle Ages tried to perceive the harmony in the immense pulsing variety of life in the universe. The underlying theme is presented not as a conscious intellectual principle, but as an attitude of mind, and its recognition is one of the most useful contributions to the understanding of the *Parlement* that has been made in recent years. It is not that something of the kind had not been realized before, but that the realization was inadequate and unconnected, especially with the earlier parts of the poem.

The literary treatment of the poem is particularly welcome. The poem is not forced into a meaning suitable to the date of this marriage or that betrothal. No doubt there are possible contemporary references in the *Parlement*, but these are marginal at best. The meaning, in its totality of ideas, associations, and attitudes, is allowed to rise out of the poem itself; and the poem is read, not in an intellectual and emotional vacuum, following the heresy of one modern school of criticism, but as it stands in relation to the great traditions of classical and medieval poetry, philosophy, and science. The bulk of Dr. Bennett's monograph is necessarily devoted to the first part of the *Parlement* up to and including the appearance of Nature, since in this first part there is most that is unfamiliar to us, and most of Chaucer's borrowings from books. With the first part properly understood, Dr. Bennett interprets the debate convincingly. He makes excellent use of parallel passages from Chaucer's other works, and makes clear the nobility of the hawks and the vulgarity of the goose, duck, and cuckoo. He might perhaps have pushed farther his analysis of the debate and of the attitude of the lower birds. There is still something to be said about the representation, through the vulgar birds, of a genuine question in Chaucer's mind, and in the mind of his age, about the nature of *fine amour*. However, Dr. Bennett is the first to admit that his discussion is not exhaustive; and he opens up fruitful subjects for speculation.

The Appendix giving materials towards a history of the development of the personification Nature will particularly interest medievalists, and is the bare bones of a monograph in itself. Elsewhere there are few inaccuracies, though the bibliographical references are somewhat scanty, which may puzzle the non-specialist. There are many shrewd and fresh observations, as when it is pointed out that if l. 118 is to be taken literally, Venus must have been a morning star. This may cause some revision of ideas about the date. Some reservations may be made on minor points. The verbal influence of Dante on the description of the garden is perhaps overrated (pp. 76-78); here the effects of *Le Roman de la Rose* are probably stronger. The argument that Chaucer was influenced in any but the most general way by Aristotelian science, except through *Le Roman*, seems very doubtful. It is also more doubtful than Dr. Bennett allows that Chaucer knew Boccaccio's *Chiose* to the *Teseida*; Pratt's arguments (*S.P.*, xlii (1945)), though vulnerable here and there, are still very strong. In other places there is, of course, room to differ, but such queries do not affect the general exposition.

It is a pity that with all its many virtues, and written as it often is with lightness and grace, the book sometimes gives an impression of congestion. A commentary of its very nature is difficult to organize, and here it is sometimes

difficult to keep in mind the general line of the poem. The digression on Spenser, for example (pp. 112-21), excellent in itself, should have had a section to itself. Perhaps the common reader, or even the undergraduate reader, might have been wooed a little more ardently without any loss of learning or authority. Scholars will certainly read the book, but it deserves a wider audience of all interested in English poetry, in tradition and the individual genius, in the European qualities and English modifications of our literary culture. The book is beautifully produced, if not without misprints, and the illustrations are excellent, but again with the common reader in mind, the price seems much too high.

D. S. BREWER

**A Tale of Wonder. A Source Study of *The Wife of Bath's Tale*.** By SIGMUND EISNER. Pp. 148. Wexford: John English, 1957.

It is well known that incidents from many Arthurian romances find parallels in Irish saga literature. On the other hand, the standard Arthurian setting is British, as for the most part are the personal, and even the place-, names. Sometimes a more or less complete parallel can be drawn between Arthurian and extant Welsh literature. The most probable conclusion to be drawn is that the Arthurian romances are continental or English variants on ultimately Welsh (British) themes, and that the Irish parallels indicate rather the kinship of the Irish and Welsh traditions than that the ultimate source is Irish. The earliest Welsh literature has not survived so abundantly as Irish, but that almost certainly is the result of mere chance. This is of particular importance for *The Wife of Bath's Tale*, which many scholars have regarded as ultimately Irish, and for which Maynadier postulated a direct transmission from Ireland to England. As opposed to this, Mr. Eisner has shown the capital importance of the Arthurian setting, and demonstrated that the *Tale* with its English analogues belongs to a group which includes not only the Irish sovereignty legends, but also two cycles of Arthurian romance, that of Perceval and that of Le Bel Inconnu with its motif of the *fier baiser*. Mr. Eisner, however, accepts an ultimately Irish origin, and suggests a channel of transmission from Ireland to Wales, to Brittany, and so to France, England, and the Continent generally. The convincing parallels drawn would for many scholars be sufficient proof of the hypothesis. In the final analysis, however, the theory of distinctly Irish ancestry depends on the use of the word 'sovereignty' in both Irish and English (not in the continental Arthurian tales). As the meaning is not the same in the two languages, this is scarcely conclusive. On this theory, too, the absence of the term from the continental tales is at least puzzling. Mr. Eisner recognizes the first difficulty, and gives an explanation which is possible, but not in any way certain. On the other hand, he does not consider sovereignty legends in traditions other than the Irish. This is doubly unfortunate. Mr. Eisner misses the fact that the Irish legends go back to rites comparable to the *ἱερὸς γάμος* at Athens, and thus also misses

several striking instances in Welsh. The most obvious perhaps (in *Manawydan*, the third branch of the *Mabinogi*) is the marriage of Rhiannon (\**Rigantona*, 'Queen-goddess' = 'Sovereignty'?) with Manawydan, which carries with it the rule of Dyfed. Several studies have demonstrated that the basis of the story is pre-Christian, distinctively British and Gaulish, myth closely associated with the cult of Maponus and Matrona. Rhiannon herself is closely associated with horses, and in earlier versions may herself have been transformed into a horse. This, I suggest, parallels Mr. Eisner's transformation motif. The sovereignty of Dyfed is clearly a matter of the possession of Rhiannon. She gives food and drink to the man who wins her. She is associated with a succession of princes of Dyfed—Pwyll, Pryderi, and Manawydan. Enchantment is an intrinsic part of her role. In earlier versions Pwyll at least came to her dwelling after a hunt (an incident referred to by Mr. Eisner, but in another connexion). Indeed, most of the features advanced by Mr. Eisner as characteristic of the Irish sovereignty belong to Rhiannon also, and in her myth there can be little or no question of Irish influence; if one uses the term somewhat loosely, from the beginning the story of Rhiannon belonged to the Matter of Britain. When one remembers that definite connexions have already been established between her legend and the cycle of Le Bel Inconnu, an ultimately British origin of *The Wife of Bath's Tale* would seem almost certain. Even further confirmation may be advanced. Mr. Eisner suggests a relationship, not only to Le Bel Inconnu, but also the birth story of St. Cuthbert, as preserved in the twelfth-century *Libellus de ortu (vel nativitate) Sancti Cuthberti*, to *Lanzelet*, and to the ballad of *Kemp Owyne*. These, it might be demonstrated, all spring from early British or Pictish traditions of the Lothians, and are related to the birth stories of Modred and especially Kentigern, which in turn are ultimately derived from the myth of Maponus and Matrona. The role of the Picts as intermediaries between British and Irish tradition would probably repay consideration.

The best part of Mr. Eisner's book is his establishment of the Arthurian setting of the tale. This is an achievement of some importance, diminished though it must be by an oversimplified approach to problems of transmission, and a naïve conception of primitive religious beliefs and ceremonies.

JOHN MACQUEEN

**Morley's Canzonets for Three Voices.** Edited by JOHN EARLE UHLER. Pp. vi+50+118 (facsimile) (Louisiana State University Studies, Humanities Series 7). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957. \$2.50.

Morley was born in 1557, took his B.Mus. at Oxford in 1588, and became a gentleman of the Chapel Royal in 1592. The following year saw the first of his many publications, the *Canzonets. Or Little Short Songs to Three Voyces*. From this point on Morley produced, as author or editor, eleven music books, concluding the series in 1601 with *The Triumphes of Oriana*. Of these, the *Canzonets . . . to Three Voyces* seems to have been the most popular, for it ran

through six printings in less than forty years. Four editions appeared in London between 1593 and 1631; they are listed in *S.T.C.* as nos. 18121-4. (Mr. Uhler fails to mention the second edition of 1602, of which a copy survives at Cambridge.) Moreover, two German editions appeared, in 1612 (Cassel) and 1624 (Rostock). We may note in passing that Morley dedicated this charming collection to the Countess of Pembroke, who thus claims attention as a patroness of music as well as of literature.

That Morley's music was also published abroad is significant, for it shows that Elizabethan England did not merely import Italian madrigals and French chansons, it also sent its own music to the Continent. Morley's *Ballets* of 1595 were reprinted in Nuremberg in 1609, and, in a practical sense, the variation techniques of William Byrd and John Bull affected the work of that great Dutch organist and teacher, Jan Pieters Sweelinck.

The *Canzonets . . . to Three Voyces* were published in England and Germany in the customary part books. Of the Cassel edition of 1612 no known copy survives, but of the Rostock edition of 1624 two copies were extant until that at Breslau was destroyed during the last war. The sole remaining copy is divided between two libraries, namely, Hanover, which houses the cantus, and Leipzig which has both altus and bassus. It is this copy which forms the basis of the present facsimile edition. The reproduction of the original pages of music is good and equals that of Mr. Uhler's edition of the *Canzonets to Two Voyces*, 1595, published by the same press in 1954.

In his introduction Mr. Uhler gathers together a variety of relevant verbal texts. There are, first of all, several Italian madrigals by Felice Anerio, which influenced the words set by Morley. (The composer's texts are anonymous, and Mr. Uhler thinks they were written by Morley himself.) Then there are two sets of texts that functioned as substitutes, one a series of sacred paraphrases preserved in Christ Church Music MSS. 739-43, and the other the German translation. To compare them is an instructive study in subject-matter as well as metrical and rhyming schemes. Morley's fourth canzonet, for instance, goes:

Lady, those eyes, those eyes of yours, that shine so clearly:  
 Why do you hide from me, that bought their beams so dearly?  
     Think not when thou exilest me,  
     Less heat in me sojourneth.  
 O no, o no, then thou beguilest thee,  
 Love doth but shine in thee, but O in me he burneth.

The pious sentiments of the Christ Church manuscripts follow Morley's rhyme scheme precisely:

Love not this world, this wicked world, nor her enticing pleasure,  
 When fortune smiles beware, make not a God of treasure.  
     Of all good gifts and graces  
     The world seeks to disarm thee;  
     O take heed and shun thou their embraces  
 For siren-like she sings sweet lullabies to charm thee.



The German translator follows Morley closely in metre and content, though not in rhyme:

Schöns Lieb, dein Äuglein sind so klar, daß ich dadurch entzündet gar;

Warum kehrst du sie von mir, der ich dich lieb' von Herzen.

Denk nicht, wenn du mich gleich willst verstoßen,

Daß ich dich ablass',

O nein, o nein, das geht dir nicht an:

Obschon die Lieb bei dir sehr schlecht, so tut sie doch in mir recht brennen.

Mr. Uhler's transcriptions are not always faultless. In the second line of Morley's text he reads 'brought' instead of 'bought', and in the second line of the German text he reads 'hehlstu', where it should be 'kehrstu'. (In modern spelling, as here used for both English and German texts, 'kehrstu' becomes 'kehrst du'.) In the fifth canzone, line 4, 'lieblich' (lovely) is given as 'leiblich' (bodily) and 'nicht' (not) as 'micht'. Whether these errors are editorial or typographical is hard to determine. Mr. Uhler states:

The verbal text only . . . rearranged in compliance with rhyme and rhythm, is included in his [i.e. Fellowes's] *English Madrigal Verse*. For the first time since the edition of 1631, the words are reproduced below exactly as Morley wrote them in the cantus part, with the exception that for the sake of space, the repetitions are omitted.

However, the editor does not consistently omit repetitions. In Canzonet 3, for instance, Fellowes's last line reads: 'If you would let me, I would kiss you ever.' Uhler prints:

If you would let me, I would kisse you euer.

I would kisse kisse and kisse, and kisse, kisse,  
and kisse, and kisse, you euer.

On the other hand, in the fourth canzonet, quoted above *in toto*, both Fellowes and Uhler give: 'O no, then thou beguilest thee.' But if metrical rules are to be observed at least one repetition of 'O, no' is needed to make the line as long as the corresponding line in the Christ Church manuscript. The same line is quite mishandled in the German text: the editor erroneously adds a single 'Oh nein' to the fourth line, omitting the phrase entirely in the fifth line.

Students and lovers of Morley will be grateful for the facsimile and for the collection of relevant material in the preface, even though that material would profit from certain revisions.

FREDERICK W. STERNFELD

**The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare.** By IRVING RIBNER.

Pp. xii + 354. Princeton: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 40s. net.

Since F. E. Schelling published *The Elizabethan Chronicle Play* in 1902, the study of this subject has been revolutionized by the work of E. M. W. Tillyard, J. D. Wilson, A. P. Rossiter, and L. B. Campbell, and Irving Ribner's book is a welcome attempt to resurvey the development of Elizabethan plays concerned

with English history in the light of the latest research, including much of his own. His main aims are to formulate a new concept of the history play, to illustrate it in fullness of detail, and to show how the history play forms part of a continuous dramatic tradition from the Middle Ages to 1642. His method of treatment is generally chronological, though he sets it aside at times in order to discuss special developments of the form, such as the biographical play and the use of legendary and Anglo-Saxon history.

One of Ribner's most important and interesting chapters is the first, in which he arrives at his concept of the history play. He justly rejects Schelling's notion that the history play had its origin in patriotic feelings inspired by the defeat of the Armada and W. D. Briggs's idea that its writers recognized 'no other principle of connection than that of personality' when they used chronicle materials. He thinks that Tillyard errs in 'limiting the goals of the serious history play within the narrow limits' of Edward Hall's theory of providential history, and decides that this theory was only one of the seven basic purposes of the form, which he outlines as follows:

Those stemming from classical and humanist philosophies of history include (1) a nationalistic glorification of England; (2) an analysis of contemporary affairs, both national and foreign, so as to make clear the virtues and failings of contemporary statesmen; (3) a use of past events as a guide to political behavior in the present; (4) a use of history as documentation for political theory; and (5) a study of past historical disaster as an aid to stoical fortitude in the present. Those stemming from medieval Christian philosophy of history include: (6) illustration of the providence of God as the ruling force in human—and primarily political—affairs, and (7) exposition of a rational plan in human events which must affirm the wisdom and justice of God.

He defines history plays as 'those which use, for any combination of these purposes, material drawn from national chronicles and assumed by the dramatist to be true'. An important fact which emerges from his discussion of the origins of the history play is that the humanists were more concerned with effective didactics than with truth for its own sake. Correspondingly, the great majority of the playwrights felt justified in altering or adjusting their source-materials in order to promote their doctrinal purposes.

No one is likely to gainsay Ribner's argument that the history play grew out of the adaptation of the morality play to the new political and religious purposes of the early sixteenth century, a development effectively illustrated by his examination of Skelton's *Magnyfycence*, Bale's *Kynge Johan* ('our first history play'), *Gorboduc*, and the use of personifications as late as the 1590's in *Nobody and Somebody*. His discussion of the place of *Tamburlaine* in this development is open to question, however. He rightly points to *Tamburlaine* as the first play to blend 'the tradition of romantic heroic drama with that of the didactic moral history play', but his claim that in 'both parts of *Tamburlaine* there is a strong and direct denial of the role of providence in human affairs' discounts the peculiar patterns of divine retribution suggested in the second part of the play. Sigismond's perjury is followed by his defeat and his acknowledgement that

'God hath thundered vengeance from on high'; Tamburlaine's murder of his son is followed by Soria's prayer that he may 'consume with heat', and his burning of the Koran by a fatal drying of the moisture in his blood which attests the vengeance of Allah.

Ribner's chapter on 'Early History Plays' shows that only *The Troublesome Raigne of John King of England* reveals an interest in the problems of history at all comparable to Shakespeare's. His discussion of Shakespeare's tetralogies is the most controversial part of his book. He rejects Tillyard's theory that they form a single epic unit. He emphasizes their topical applications much more than Tillyard does; in the *Henry VI* plays he claims that Shakespeare censures rebellion against a *de facto* king as an answer to those who pointed to the weakness of Elizabeth's claim to the throne: in the second tetralogy, on the other hand, he argues that Shakespeare 'turned to the obvious problem of the type of man who should succeed Elizabeth' and showed that ability to rule was 'ultimately more important than the divine sanction of hereditary right'. Though Ribner certainly proves that Shakespeare attached more importance to native ability to rule than other defenders of the Tudor dynasty, he seems to underestimate the significance of hereditary right in Shakespeare's interpretation of history and kingship. Shakespeare, I suggest, favoured Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI not because he absolutely endorsed their *de facto* hold on the crown but because he thought that those who conspired against them were not motivated by love of the commonweal. When a lawful claimant to a throne is imbued by this love (e.g. Henry of Richmond or Malcolm of Scotland), Shakespeare obviously favours his cause. Ribner declares that 'the notion that rebellion against a tyrant may be justified is not an orthodox one', but there is evidence that to the orthodox a usurper was *ipso facto* a tyrant and could be forcibly dethroned; in *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, for instance, Hooker remarks that when a man 'without right of blood' is crowned king, 'all these new elections and investings are utterly void, they make him no indefeasible estate, the inheritor by blood may dispossess him as a usurper' (*Works* (Oxford, 1839), ii. 401).

In his final chapter Ribner attributes the decline of the history play partly to the competition of other kinds of drama, such as the realistic comedy of contemporary life, partly to its submergence into various types of romantic drama. In an illuminating analysis of Heywood's *Edward IV* he shows how the history play was declining as early as 1600, for the sentimental romance of *Jane Shore* is given greater prominence in both parts of this play than any other theme. More could have been said about the way in which the scope of the history play was reduced to suit the particular interests of the different audiences of the public and private theatres in the seventeenth century. Ribner does draw attention, however, to an interesting new departure, namely, Ben Jonson's demand for 'truth of argument' in serious drama, and to the way in which it is exemplified in the last important history play, Ford's *Perkin Warbeck*. All told, his book is a lucid, thoughtful, and well-balanced survey of a complicated subject. His appendixes include useful lists of English history plays (1519-1653) and their principal sources, together with a generous bibliography of secondary materials.

WILLIAM A. ARMSTRONG

**Shakespere's Love's Labor's Won.** By T. W. BALDWIN. Pp. viii+42. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1957. \$5.00.

At the centre of this very handsome and expensively produced volume lies a tiny kernel of fact in which all Shakespearians must be interested: a Mr. Pottesman of London has discovered in a binding two fragments of manuscript, dated 1603 and 1607, one of which (1603) gives a list of book-titles, including a talismanic and crucial one—'loves labor won'.

So far Mr. Pottesman, and so far certainty. Professor Baldwin has sought to weave round the manuscript an argument which will give meaning to the title in this context. In this review I seek to give some reasons for dissent or for reservation of judgement on the conclusions which he reaches.

We could say something important about this find if we could prove (1) that the title *loves labor won* in the manuscript is independent of Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, which mentions it as one of Shakespeare's plays, or (2) that the title indicates the physical existence of a printed book. Mr. Baldwin takes it that both these things are true. He takes it that the list of book-titles represents stock held in the shop of Christopher Hunt, who in 1603 was a bookseller in Exeter—'books newly received from London, doubtless by "carrier"'. This assumption seems to depend basically on one entry. Of this Mr. Baldwin says: 'It commands, "direct a letter to edward dighte to be delivered at christofer hvnts in pater noster reu nere ye Kings hed in london september 1607" three petty school books in quantity' (p. 11). I cannot follow the syntax of this sentence, and I see no reason to suppose that the entry quoted 'gives the clue' that the manuscript belonged to Christopher Hunt.

Mr. Baldwin further supposes that the localities mentioned in the manuscript—Winterbourne in Dorset (but need it be this Winterbourne?), Breamore in Hampshire, and Hill Deveril in Wiltshire—point to Exeter as the home of the manuscript, but in fact Salisbury is a more natural centre for these places.<sup>1</sup> From Urbana, Illinois, the whole West Country may look like a cosy corner but I suspect that Wiltshire tradesmen of the seventeenth century thought of Exeter as being at the other end of the earth. I just do not believe that 'valentyne at bremer was mr doringtons cooke' is going to travel 200 miles to Exeter and back to spend eightpence on the binding of a service book, when Salisbury lay but nine odd miles away.

Again, need we suppose that the list represents stock held in a shop? It may be so, but certain factors tell against it. We would expect such an inventory to copy down titles as they stand in the volumes concerned, but some titles show knowledge derived from other sources. What seemed at one time to be the most glaring example of this turns out to be one of Mr. Baldwin's errors: it is not true that *S.T.C.* 18292 is 'Anon'; the title-page reads 'written by *Christopher Muriell* the elder'. Yet others, such as 'bushop of winchesters sermon at ye coronation' and 'orders set forth lately by ye Kings maiesty & ye covnsell to be vsed in this tyme of siknes' (*S.T.C.* 9209) are far from transcription and sound

<sup>1</sup> McKerrow's *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers 1557-1640* shows that booksellers of the name of Hammande were in Salisbury over the period with which we are concerned.

like memorial reconstructions. If so, what was memory drawing on? We cannot know, of course, but as good a guess as Mr. Baldwin's would be that the list sets out titles of books ordered or to be ordered by the bookseller himself (out of his knowledge of the trade), or ordered for customers who had heard of them.<sup>1</sup> We can easily underestimate the extent to which seventeenth-century trading was bespoke trading, and this may be a case in point.

Certainly the list of books does not seem to be haphazard: like things come together throughout. The list of '[inte]rludes & tragedyes' contains only plays, and no plays appear elsewhere. It begins with 'mother bombye' then has three interludes, then three chronicle histories, then two interludes, then 'friar bacon', then two Shakespeare comedies, then 'knak to know a knave / knak to know an honest man / loves labor lost / loves labor won'. The symmetry suggests organization, and organization suggests something more than a merely factual record of books 'newly received . . . by "carrier"'. Could the desire to possess paired plays have driven a connoisseur to order a play whose title he had only seen in Meres? Men order books out of critical reviews today; did they never do so in the seventeenth century? Mr. Baldwin does not really face the difficulties of his theory, nor admit that the evidence might be used as part of quite a different argument. The essential points, (1) independence of Meres, (2) factual existence of the book, are not really established.

We are left at the end of the argument with Mr. Pottesman's 'brute and irreducible fact' and with little else. But we must be grateful to Mr. Baldwin for presenting it to us so very handsomely.

G. K. HUNTER

**The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker.** Edited by FREDSON BOWERS. Vol. III. Pp. vi+650. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. 55s. net.

This third volume of Professor Bowers's edition of Dekker's plays—a fourth is yet to come—maintains the elaborate and austere standard of technical scholarship established by its predecessors, and one can only admire the industry that has collated every known copy of the six plays and one pageant included.

*The Roaring Girl* was printed by Nicholas Okes for Thomas Archer in 1611 as the joint work of Dekker and Middleton, without registration. The editor thinks that an assignment by Archer to Hugh Perry on 10(?) February 1631 'indicates that he held a good copyright'. I doubt whether any such inference is admissible, since it is doubtful from what source other than entrance copy-right could derive; but there was clearly nothing surreptitious about the publica-

<sup>1</sup> On the other hand cf. the inventory of Roger Ward's Shrewsbury stock given in *The Library*, xiii (1958), 250-69; this must be cataloging real books, but the titles are often very cryptic. Yet it is only the equivalent of the modern auctioneer's catalogue; the list was only compiled to provide a rough valuation of the stock, and I am not sure how far its vaguenesses are parallel to those in Mr. Pottesman's manuscript. It is probably worth while noting in this context that the list of haberdashery in the second fragment of manuscript gives very few indications of quantities—a further argument (as Mr. Kenneth Povey points out to me) against the theory that the manuscript catalogued stock.

tion. The collaborated play has a preface by Middleton, presumably printed from his autograph: for the text Bowers conjectures a transcript by Dekker of the composite foul papers, prepared for sale to the Prince's Men, though admittedly the evidence is meagre. If he is right the absence of any playhouse features would lead us to suppose that the prompt-copy was made from the transcript, and that this, having served its purpose, was allowed to come into the printers' hands. This it must have done pretty promptly, for the play was probably only written in the autumn of 1610.

If *this be not a Good Play*, Dekker's unaided work, followed the next year. It too was unregistered, but a dedication to the Queen's Men shows its publication to have been authorized. The source may have been a rather rough autograph that had been annotated for the stage, but again the evidence is slight.

*Troia Nova Triumphans*, Sir John Swinnerton's mayoral pageant of 29 October 1612, was registered, but allowed only subject to its being 'further Authourised'. The editor conjectures that 'The further authority required was perhaps the assurance that it was authorized as the official account, or that the Merchant Taylors were willing to release the description'. It is most unlikely that the Warden who made the demand troubled about either. The proviso doubtless refers, as in other cases, to an official licence, which may or may not have been obtained.

*Match Me in London*, according to Bowers, 'was relicensed without fee by Buc on 21 August 1623 as "An Old Play" (Bentley, *Jacobean Stage*, III, 256)'. Buc had gone mad and been relieved of his office more than a year before the date in question: it was Herbert who, without fee, relicensed the piece as an old play 'formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke'. Needless to say, Bentley is in no way responsible for the confusion. The play was not registered till 8 November 1630 and was printed with the date 1631. The dedication of this ten-year-old piece to Lodowick Carlell, with its plaintive 'my voyce is decaying with my Age', suggests that Dekker was in desperate need of a gratuity, but it proves at any rate that the publication was authorized. The editor, however, after an elaborate consideration of the composition and press-correction, from which it appears that Dekker may possibly have seen some of the proofs, refrains from speculating on the source of the text.

*The Virgin Martyr*, avowedly a collaboration between Dekker and Massinger, was, says Bowers, "'reformed" and licensed by Buc', adding, not very helpfully, that Bentley 'usefully discusses the 1620 licensing'. Buc's licence, 'Oct. 6, 1620. For new reforming the *Virgin Martyr* for the Red Bull, 40s.', is only recorded by Gifford, who assumed that it must apply to an old play. Bentley demurs, arguing that the fee is impossibly large for a mere revision; and it is true that 'reformation' is the regular term for censoring. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that the phrase 'new reforming' does not imply a previous history, such as critical opinion has commonly postulated for the piece. Bowers does not mention that on 7 July 1624 Herbert licensed 'the adding of a scene to *The Virgin Martyr*', but since this was after the play had been printed it has no probable bearing on the extant text. After registration on 7 December 1621 an edition appeared with the date 1622 and two strikingly variant title-pages,



which are here reproduced without comment. The editor, excusably, takes no notice of the three later editions. The evidence suggests that the first quarto was set up from autograph sheets of the two authors: Bowers does not call them foul papers, nor, so far as I know, is there anything that points in that direction: presumably each author made a fair copy of his scenes, which were then fitted together into a composite whole. We are offered an analysis of the characteristics of the two sections on the basis of the attributions proposed by Gifford.

*The Witch of Edmonton* is known to have been written and acted in 1621, but, after a revival probably in 1635, it was first registered on 21 May 1658 and was printed the same year as written 'By divers well-esteemed Poets, William Rowley, Thomas Dekker, John Ford, &c.', an ascription that inspires little confidence, and on which the editor makes no comment. The source of the text is shown by the presence of actors' names to have been a theatrical manuscript, and at this date there would, of course, be nothing surprising in a prompt-book being sent to press; Bowers, however, conjectures a stage-contaminated transcript of autograph contributions.

*The Wonder of a Kingdom* was registered on 16 May 1631, but apparently not printed till after what would seem to have been the same manuscript had been re-entered to another stationer on 24 February 1636. Bowers refuses to speculate on the source of the text beyond suggesting that the printer may have had before him an autograph or a copy of one, while admitting that it may equally well have been a private copy of the prompt-book.

Comparing the conclusions here reached with those of earlier volumes, it appears that a fuller analysis of the evidence is accompanied at once by a growing elaboration of hypothesis and a dwindling confidence therein. Is it that our hopes of being able to infer from the features of a printed text the nature of the manuscript that served as copy are fated to vanish like a dream? W. W. GREG

**Heroic Knowledge. An Interpretation of Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes.** By ARNOLD STEIN. Pp. xiv+238. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: Oxford University Press, 1957. 40s. net.

This book is full of good things, but it is hard going. Mr. Stein has three concerns on hand: to sustain a thesis, to interpret two mature and difficult poems, and to consider matters of great importance, which are not confined to the issues raised by the text, in the belief that poetry of this kind may 'exercise and purge and strengthen the moral imagination of man, even political man . . . it is a vision that makes intelligible hope available'.

It is not surprising that he should put up more questions than he can answer, and it is one of his many merits that he is disarmingly frank about this. 'I should hate to have any reader think I had solved all his problems for him.' His is thoughtful writing and it requires a strenuous response. He likes making fine points, not in order to haggle, but to be sure of not missing implications, and he will turn quickly from very close scrutiny to equally far-flung conjecture in an attempt to test a universal application.



The form of the book is rather unusual and not altogether satisfactory. The argument is dispensed in thirteen essays which are loosely connected as they follow through the chief stages of each poem in turn. But the unit of the essay admits of dilation sometimes to a fault, so that the argument eddies and strays, losing force. Meanwhile, much of what is crammed into notes would stand better incorporated into the text, where a few more digressions would do no harm. The Postscript is important and it is as well to take the hint dropped in the Preface and read the last section twice, before and after the series of essays. This Postscript states the thesis, that is, the assumption that what Milton is primarily concerned with in both poems is the achievement of that real knowledge by which the soul comes, or rather is brought, into its own and is disciplined either to act rightly or, in the case of Samson, to die well:

One might say that the second Adam, like all sons of God, has to think his way back to his original creation, has to *remember* it as the Platonist might say; and this he must do by uniting his beginning and his end of being in the thought of action.

Salvation comes through knowledge, intuitive, discursive, and lastly inspirational. The course of each poem is traced with the intent of showing that Milton is concerned with 'a definition of heroic knowledge not of heroic rejection'. How new this contention is is not to the point; what matters is how convincing it appears to be, and when it is realized that Mr. Stein is not writing controversially, though he is often in vigorous disagreement with sundry recent critics, his argument makes rewarding reading. With the poems fresh in mind his commentary is intelligible, pertinent, and challenging, but no one would have any profit or delight whose acquaintance with *Paradise Regained* was slight or distant. Mr. Stein is perhaps hardly aware how much he is taking for granted.

Mr. Stein is not unaware of, but not here much occupied with, the criticism which attends to the traditional nature and period interest of what Milton says; he is anxious to expatiate on wider connexions as, for instance, on Platonic thought on the one hand, or modern philosophical and psychological speculation on the other. There is much cross reference of an enlivening kind. His own subtle and sinewy intelligence rises to the demands made by Milton's. He recognizes at once that in planning *Paradise Regained* the poet 'must have known what he was up against and relished it'. He is alive to the tough compactness of the style: 'And although the physical level of the drama is always uppermost and transparent, underneath are fascinating implications, packed down intricately, but inviting the mind to penetrate and to follow them into patterns that relate to still other patterns'. He realizes that 'the joy in the performance is properly sober and subtle but it is permeating'. He speaks as though he readily recognized the heroic nature of Milton's Christ:

Milton gives us the rarest and most hopeful of images, wisdom without bodily decrepitude, early, with the hero young, at the flower, unbruised. . . . In refusing to imitate God directly, by transcendence, Christ maintains the difference, the distance between God and man; but he does so while demonstrating the similarity between man and God, by acting out the perfection of the image of God in man.

The critic is well suited to demonstrate the dramatic power of the characterization of the later Satan and to remark the fatal limitation of his preoccupation with 'knowledge-as-power' as contrasted with the Christ's revelation of 'knowledge-as-love'. He is penetrating on that strangely tragic speech of the devil's which for once rings true. 'Let that come when it comes' (*P. R.*, iii. 204-50). He is astute in tracing the intricate structure of the temptations and alive to the latent dramatic force; he is shrewd on Dalila's motives and Manoa's homeliness; sound on the connexion between Samson's long moral and intellectual preparation and the sudden advent of inspiration; sensitive both to the movement of the play—the 'Slow turning of the tide'—and to the tone of Samson's farewell. He trusts Milton's moral insight and effortlessly admires the same virtues of piety, wisdom, and patience. He refrains from commending one poem at the expense of the other and although the comparisons are frequent they are not pressed too hard.

Sometimes the style is wantonly difficult; there are patches of jargon, some his own and some quoted; there are tortuous sentences, long parentheses, and cryptic allusions. Considering how interesting the content is and how intelligent the approach, this is a singularly tiring book to read. To take it up when any edge has been taken off the mind is worse than useless. But perhaps this is an unfair objection when one reflects that here is a critic in his prime struggling with a poet who in his maturity was wrestling either with a hero who is hard beset by a supersubtle Satan or with a man who is himself 'agonistes'. The great virtue of Mr. Stein's criticism is that it recognizes, respects, and enjoys the serious, hard quality of Milton's last poems.

K. M. LEA

**The Correspondence of Thomas Percy and Evan Evans.** Edited by ANEIRIN LEWIS. Pp. xl+214. (The Percy Letters. General Editors: DAVID NICHOL SMITH and CLEANTH BROOKS. Vol. V.) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1957; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 40s. net.

This volume prints twenty-one letters by Thomas Percy and the same number of replies by Evan Evans, the Welsh scholar and poet. The bulk of the correspondence belongs to the years 1761-7, but there are also two letters of 1776. In appendixes, the editor presents three other letters by Evans as well as a number of relevant letters by his contemporaries.

The collection is valuable for several reasons. It illustrates Percy's eagerness to learn what were the nature and themes of Welsh poems, and the encouragement he gave to Evans to bring out translations in English and Latin of some of the masterpieces of the past. It indicates, too, what Percy was looking for in poetry and had already found in 'the ancient Runic bards'. In Evans's translation of a Welsh ode, Percy enjoyed 'the sublime', 'warmth of imagination', 'bold and animated' images. The ode lacked 'cool accuracy' but revealed 'one continued fiery torrent of poetic flame'.

Percy was not satisfied with only the more sophisticated Welsh poetry, but

sought examples of medieval popular ballads and interludes. He supported his request with a statement typical of his period: 'The true genius and spirit of a people are best seen from their diversions.' Evans was unable to satisfy him, because the only ballads and interludes he knew of were of comparatively recent date.

The two scholars exchanged opinions about Ossian; dismissed Warton's attempt at deriving 'the words *Elf* and *Goblin* from the *Guelfes* and *Gibbeline*'; considered whether or not the metre of *Piers Plowman* was like the one used by the old Welsh bards; and gave each other news of the progress of their own studies and publications.

This work reveals clearly the new interest in Wales and Welsh literature that was to become so evident in the later eighteenth century; and it also gives us an excellent picture of two scholars at work. Percy, well supported by patrons, was in touch with (and mentions) Gray, Johnson, and other literary leaders of the time. The more temperamental Evans remained a poor curate all his life, but in his wanderings about the country sought admission everywhere to extant collections of Welsh manuscripts. He lost his patron and only at the end of his life found a new one in that same Paul Panton who had helped Christopher Smart. Fortune treated Evans and Percy very differently but the two men are alike in the way in which they resolutely found, copied, and published the great poetry of the past.

Mr. Lewis's introduction and notes are excellent; they illuminate the text admirably. Criticism of the work can only concern itself with trifles. The editor might have been wise to print the postmarks of the letters, if only because they sometimes amplify the dating: for example, letter xiv is dated as 'c. April 1763', when the postmark is definitely '18 AP'. A note, too, seems required on 'Mr Thomas Palin next door to the Golden Lion in Forrest Street, Chester' (p. 109). *The Chester Guide* (2nd ed. 1782, pp. 102-3) states that Thomas Palin ('Clerk of St. John's') lived in Foregate Street, where the Golden Lion was to be found. There must be some mistake about 'Forrest Street', possibly made by Evans and certainly repeated by Percy (p. 116). The error appears to have caused the delay of two months that occurred before Evans received the copy of Mallet that Percy had sent him.

'W. Griffith', who received one, and wrote one, of the letters printed in Appendix I, is not identified by the editor. Was he the William Griffith who had been a member of Oriel College and had taken his bachelor's degree before being ordained priest (31 August 1760) at Ross, Herefordshire? It seems possible.

To the references to Welsh interludes (p. 44), the English reader may care to add the two chapters (59-60) in Borrow's *Wild Wales* and a useful article by T. J. R. Jones in *Theatre Notebook*, ii (1948), 62-66.

CECIL PRICE

**The Cornell Wordsworth Collection. A Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts Presented to the University by Mr. Victor Emanuel, Cornell 1919.** Compiled by GEORGE HARRIS HEALEY. Pp. xiv+458. Ithaca, New

York: Cornell University Press, 1957; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 80s. net.

Mrs. Cynthia Morgan St. John of Ithaca, who died in 1919, spent forty years on assembling a Wordsworth library. After her death Mr. Victor Emanuel bought it and presented it to his university. Since then he has sustained and extended it. The catalogue, therefore, includes publications as late as 1955. Everything about it is first class, page, paper, type, arrangement, and illustrations. The illustrations, twenty-four in number, include reproductions of title-pages, other printed pages, and manuscript. There are specimens of the handwriting of Wordsworth (early and late), Dorothy Wordsworth, Mary Wordsworth, Sarah Hutchinson, Coleridge, Sara Coleridge, and Southey. The catalogue is arranged in ten parts: I. Writings of Wordsworth in Book Form, 1793-1850; II. Writings of Wordsworth in Book Form, 1851-1955; III. Writings of Wordsworth in Early Periodicals; IV. Writings of Wordsworth in Early Anthologies and Other Books; V. Wordsworthiana; VI. Coleridge and his Family; VII. The Lake District; VIII. Books of Associative Interest; IX. Manuscripts; X. Miscellaneous Items. A very full twenty-six-page index follows. Its fullness may be gauged by its inclusion (nearly a column) of all Wordsworth's publishers in his lifetime.

The short Part X includes the well-known Shuter portrait of Wordsworth (1798) and a miniature portrait of about 1800 by an unidentified artist. One will perhaps have turned first to Part IX to see what the Cornell collection has that no one else can have. Letters naturally bulk largest. There are 144 of Wordsworth's (the earliest 1796 to Cottle) including those to Henry Reed. Reed's letters to Wordsworth are also here. Other members of the Wordsworth family are represented. There are many letters of Coleridge and his family. Manuscripts 'of associative interest' are wide-ranging, some very near like Reed's, others not so near. They include Cottle's 'Bristol Album, 1795' which contains entries from 1795 to 1844.

Next in importance comes Part I. It will save many students of Wordsworth, as the catalogue's opportune arrival saved me, from having to work out for themselves answers to those bibliographical questions which so often crop up. No previous publication has all the information. Take the 1800 *Lyrical Ballads* of which this collection has six copies. Two of them are of exceptional interest. One retains on p. vi. of the Preface the subsequently deleted reference to Coleridge's *Christabel* 'without which I should not yet have ventured to present a second volume to the public'. The other has a cancel whereby the well-known omission of fifteen lines of *Michael* is corrected. Or take Wordsworth's various collected editions, which are by no means easy to get straight. Here they all are with full particulars.

Space forbids detailed reports on the other Parts, but the number of separate listings in the catalogue is 3,206. It is impossible that Part V, long though it is, includes all the articles on Wordsworth that have appeared in periodicals. It may be that a conscientious check of this Part with the British Museum catalogue would reveal the absence of some unimportant Victorian edition. But

all the Wordsworth student wants is in this catalogue. Handsome it is, and handsome it does.

H. M. MARGOLIOUTH

**On the Poetry of Keats.** By E. C. PETTET. Pp. viii+396. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 35s. net.

Mr. Pettet has written a book which amounts to being neither quite so comprehensive as to constitute a general study of Keats's poetry nor a study of a special aspect of it; his subject is how Keats went to work in a certain body of his poems, those more illustrative of his 'poesy', or faculty of presenting luxurious dream-states and longings; but since the poems selected for this purpose include *Endymion*, *Lamia*, and the *Nightingale* and *Grecian Urn* Odes, and much other work considered in less detail, by the concluding chapter a judgement is reached which has implications for Keats's poetry as a whole, and its authority is reinforced by the care, concreteness, and proportioned detail of the criticism of particular poems which has gone before.

There are three preliminary chapters ranging more widely over the question of the literary influences on the early poetry and their rapid assimilation, Keats's characteristic imagery and his use of verbal melody, vowel repetition, and so on. One can see the relevance of this to what comes later: Mr. Pettet wants to rehabilitate the sheer and inevitably limited sensuous mastery of Keats from those contemporary critics of romantic poetry who would have him a metaphysician; to understand the nature of the deliberate effort of 'poesy' its highly subtle technical groundwork must be understood. But this part of the book, amounting to nearly a third, seems too long; the third chapter on melody is overburdened with minutiae, and does not altogether avoid that kind of unreal pure musical analysis of verbal statements which leaves out of account the complicating effect of meaning (one remembers I. A. Richards's dread example of 'Peep into a roomy cot', and 'Deep into a gloomy grot').

Then comes the meat of the book: two long chapters on *Endymion*, one on the ambiguous treatment of love in Keats (misleadingly called 'La Belle Dame sans Mercy', since this poem is hardly discussed), and further chapters on the *Nightingale*, *Melancholy*, and *Grecian Urn* Odes. In this latter part the treatment becomes more energetic, directed, and even polemical. Mr. Pettet argues that there has been 'far too much legerdemain' in making connexions between brilliant speculative passages in Keats's letters and the poems that he actually wrote (p. 295). We should be content with the vitality and variety of his power of rendering sensible experience and not look for a metaphysic of imagination created by the semantic special pleading of Keats's modern critics (p. 354).

Such an approach is modest and sensible after the speculative excesses that, since *Keats and Shakespeare*, seem to have become the current coin of Keatsian scholarship. But one great weakness of the argument is that it does not meet the problems created by *Hyperion*. Both versions of that work present poetry as the highest form of knowledge, and this becomes explicit in the words of

Moneta in *The Fall of Hyperion*. Mr. Pettet makes a good point about the latter passage when he says (p. 353) that Keats's virtual dismissal of his earlier poetry as a mere 'feast of summer fruit' gives the lie to his modern critics; but this is not wholly acceptable: pure description does not extinguish sense in *The Rape of the Lock*, whatever Pope said later in the dramatic context of another poem. In any case a fuller discussion of both versions and Keats's reasons for revision is required for the author's purpose.

In a long analysis of *Endymion* much is made of the, surely rather slight, narrative movement of the poem, as against attempts to read it as a Neoplatonic allegory, particularly those of Thorpe and C. L. Finney. The crux here is the 'pleasure thermometer' passage at the end of the first book and the lines on 'fellowship with essence' at the beginning of the second. Since the Greek myth is an affirmation of pagan, sensuous love, a strictly Platonic meaning is held to be impossible; but as Notopoulos has shown (*The Platonism of Shelley* (1949), pp. 136 ff.) romantic Neoplatonism rarely bothers to kick away the ladder of sensuous ascent; to link moments of intense emotional experience with a perception of eternal truth is characteristic of that mingling of yearning and self-indulgence which informs most of Keats's poetry. Perhaps Mr. Pettet's approach is itself too rigidly Platonist: he would argue that the presence of passionate love in the poem precludes any allegory of spiritual significance, and here he seems to be the victim of his own logic.

The handling of *Lamia* and the Odes is happier and stronger. The personally ambivalent attitude to love in *Lamia*, at once fascination and destruction, which causes in the poem moral confusion and imaginative uncertainty, is well brought out, and developed in the context of other love poems of 1819. Mr. Pettet does, if somewhat grudgingly, recognize that later in that year Keats was moving 'from a simple statement of intuition to understanding and explanation' (p. 237). Most surprising, after the rather pedestrian tone of the earlier chapters, he offers a wholly original interpretation of the *Nightingale* Ode in which many new questions are asked and answered. The bird's song is seen, not as a vehicle of mystical ecstasy and the 'eternal moment', but as in part the play of that fancy which, however delightful, is only the poet's relief from care, and which cannot cheat for long.

There is an unwarranted statement on pp. 291-2, when Keats's care in revision is contrasted with 'the hit-or-miss principle' of other romantic poets 'reluctant to tamper with the products of their inspiration'. What about Wordsworth, whose every poem is a palimpsest?

It is tonic to be reminded so judiciously of the *naïveté* and immaturity, the adolescent yearning, that is the stuff of so much of Keats's poetry, as it is of Rimbaud's in a more delinquent mode, when the critic is also aware of the accomplishment of expression that went with it. And if Mr. Pettet sometimes leans over backwards to escape the philosophical Keats of the pundits, he is also, more fitfully, conscious of the depth and authenticity of feeling that could permit Keats to turn in upon his own inadequacies and attempt to cross the frontier of 'poesy' into the uncertain country beyond.

ROGER SHARROCK



**Popular Fiction 100 Years Ago.** By MARGARET DALZIEL. Pp. viii + 188. London: Cohen and West, 1957. 20s. net.

Miss Dalziel's investigation of the substrata of early Victorian fiction is enterprising, instructive, and gallant. The gallantry is obvious to anyone who has spent even an afternoon in a stack-room with piles of *Family Herald*s and *London Journals*—for the bulk of this cheap fiction, written by and for forgotten Victorians, makes tedious reading. She has indeed 'read voraciously', as her publishers claim, and it is to her credit that she has not allowed herself to be overwhelmed by the great flood of penny periodicals, serialized novels, and cheap reprints which, in the 1840's, swamped the newly literate masses.

Miss Dalziel analyses, grades, and collates many magazines and gives résumés of serials. In an interesting chapter she discusses the contribution of 'the most popular writer of our time', G. W. M. Reynolds, whose blend of sensuousness and sadism she finds a refreshing contrast to what she describes as the normal stuff of penny fiction: 'wilting and wasting, swooning and sinking, broken hearts, brain fever, remorse, decline and early death'. It is part of her aim to show what 'ordinary people liked to read 100 years ago' and in her account of the supply and demand of periodical fiction we do feel that we are coming near to grasping that elusive figure the Common Reader. It is clear that in the periodicals the Victorian working-classes were getting what they wanted—a concentration of sensationalism, mawkishness, prudery, and self-righteousness; qualities which, before criticism rehabilitated the age in modern eyes, used to be summed up by the one word, Victorianism.

It is a pity that Miss Dalziel treats periodical fiction as being *sui generis* instead of largely derivative. Most of the plots, characters, and situations give the impression of having filtered down from the major novelists, losing their strength and originality in the process. While Miss Dalziel mentions the influence of the Gothic novel she ignores the far more important and ever present relation of the hack-writer to his distinguished contemporary—even while giving an account of a serial (1857) which, with its governess-heroine, lonely mansion, insane wife, and final conflagration, is obviously one of the many progeny of *Jane Eyre*. None the less, despite this weakness, there is much of interest and value in Miss Dalziel's exploration of some forty periodicals.

When, in the second half of the book, Miss Dalziel attempts to generalize, from minor novels as well as from periodicals, about a fictional world, the result is disappointing and confusing. Her aim is now much more ambitious:

We must now consider the world presented to us in the cheap periodicals and railway fiction of the mid-19th century. We shall consider the people who inhabited it—their conduct, their standards and beliefs.

By 'railway fiction' Miss Dalziel means the Parlour and Railway Libraries, cheap series of novels published from 1847 onwards. These series included reprints of major writers as well as contemporary novelists, so that on W. H. Smith's bookstalls Mrs. Inchbald's *A Simple Story* (1791) rubbed shoulders with G. P. R. James's *Heidelberg* (1846), or Jane Austen's *Emma* (1816) with W. H. Ainsworth's *Ovingdean Grange* (1860). It must not be forgotten that



this was the true world of cheap fiction possessed by the mid-nineteenth-century reader, who paid his shilling and took his pick—a world of such richness and diversity as to make generalization about it impossible.

As Miss Dalziel's purpose is to generalize it is understandable that she should consider only those novels written, like the periodicals, in the forties and fifties, novels which will have some 'bearing on contemporary manners and morals'. What is less understandable is her inconsistency. While the majority of her references are to fiction of this period, she uses also reprints of novels written in the twenties and thirties—the products of completely different social conditions and aimed at utterly different reading publics. So that we find Pelham (1828), the typical Byronic dandy of the silver-fork school of fiction, used to fill in the picture of what she calls 'the mid-19th century hero' and novels like *Peter Simple* (1834), *Tales of the Munster Festivals* (1827), *My Cousin Nicholas* (1834), among others, used to prove points about this 'mid-19th century world of cheap fiction'. The most flagrant example of Miss Dalziel's off-hand way with dates is her use of the novel *Discipline* written by Mary Brunton, Jane Austen's contemporary, in 1814 and reprinted, like all the others, in the cheap Victorian series. At no time does she date this novel and the following extract makes clear the vague and distorted impression given:

A good deal of sympathy for governesses was flying about *at this time* [my italics] and this is reflected in fiction. Not many suffered as much as Mrs Brunton's, Ellen, (in *Discipline*). . . .

Mrs. Brunton was writing some thirty years before the governess became a fashionable topic, either in fact or fiction. Miss Dalziel's other two references to Mrs. Brunton (who died in 1818) compare her ruthlessness unfavourably with Dickens's compassion and her unawareness of the possibility of married equality with John Stuart Mill's liberalism.

This shows a strange lack of historical sense, which is evident also in Miss Dalziel's concluding chapter where, unmindful of Restoration pseudo-journals, the novels of Aphra Behn and Mrs. Manley and, above all, of *Moll Flanders*, she describes the 'true confession' story, with its untruthful or unchaste heroine, as a completely new genre of fiction. It is a shortcoming which, like her occasional foray out of the realm of railway fiction into that of the major novel—'Heroines never make old maids (except for Lily Dale)'—may be unscholarly but need not wholly invalidate her generalizations. The worth of these is, however, open to question. If a generalization about both periodical fiction and minor novels is to pass unchallenged it has to be so innocuous that it may not be worth making; e.g. 'It is equally essential that the heroine should be religious in a vague kind of way.' This sort of statement while, no doubt, it covers loosely a majority of periodical heroines and a percentage of the heroines of minor novels, exactly fits few of them. And it is the accumulation of such generalizations which gives to Miss Dalziel's fictional world its blurred effect—one which could have been avoided had she restricted her consideration to periodical fiction alone.

PATRICIA THOMSON

**Matthew Arnold and American Culture.** By JOHN HENRY RALEIGH. Pp. xii+302. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957. \$4.50.

*Matthew Arnold and American Culture* treats Arnold's ideas as they have performed in America. Tracing Arnold's influence upon American writers, it provides a criticism of American criticism.

'Part One: Groundswell' presents Arnold's early reception. Henry James found in Arnold a statement of convictions that matched his own: the need for a cosmopolitan view and for art to be aesthetically attractive and morally sound. James followed Arnold in regarding French standards of taste as antidotes to commonness in life and literature, but added the suggestion that prose as well as poetry may provide a criticism of life. Both saw America as Philistine, but where Arnold found it 'uninteresting', James found it fascinating, especially for its rapid changes. By the 1870's James had helped to establish respect for Arnold in America.

But Arnold's writings on religion in this decade roused protests against his treatment of the Bible as poetry. This was one factor in Arnold's mixed reception on his tour of 1883-4; another was the popular image that he was prissy spokesman for a lifeless aristocratic system. However mistaken Whitman and Twain were, their statements supported this image. Yet Arnold convinced so many of the younger generation that by the closing years of the century his prestige was high as a literary critic, his social criticism was discussed, and even his religious writings had gained advocates.

William Brownell was among the American intellectuals who championed Arnold into the early twentieth century. Brownell found American critical opinion lacking in sound principles, but Arnold's analyses valuable because they were framed by a rich culture. Though Brownell felt that Arnold, missing the fact that American democracy had never had an aristocratic basis, had misjudged America, he developed his programme from Arnold's thought, insisting upon a higher ideal for democracy than pure individualism.

'Part Two: Ebb' treats the Pyrrhic victory of Arnold's thought in America, as Arnold's influence rarefied, between 1895 and 1930, into platitudes of the school-room. By the 1890's, women's clubs in search of culture had picked up Arnold, as the 'English Club' at Sewanee, Tennessee, did; this club even produced a book, *Matthew Arnold and the Spirit of the Age*. Literary magazines like the *Chicago Dial* became Arnoldian organs. Arnold came to be studied in colleges, where he was often taught, or enshrined, as a prophet. The most prominent teacher, Professor Stuart Sherman of the University of Chicago, sought to wed the American tradition of Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman to the culture of Arnold, and thus to make Arnold seem the prophet of a matured democracy. Professors of the New Humanist group (P. E. More, Irving Babbitt, and Norman Foerster, especially), to which Sherman had at first belonged, looked with suspicion upon Sherman's diluting of Arnold's political and social beliefs. But Sherman's interpretation of Arnold prevailed among American students; both in the classroom and through *Matthew Arnold: How to Know Him* Sherman made Arnold seem more a platitude than a stream of fresh thought.

'Part Three: Resurgence' treats Arnold's ideas as foundations for the recent criticism of T. S. Eliot and Lionel Trilling. Eliot began with Arnold, but asserted that his concept of life did not go deep enough: Arnold had known and dealt with life's average, its 'boredom', but not with its 'horror' and 'glory'. Eliot regarded Arnold's thought as insufficiently exact, and his idea that poetry could take the place of religion as wrong. To Eliot, Arnold mixed categories, especially those of poetry and religion. Eliot preferred the Christian society, with its hierarchies, to Arnold's cultured society—belief and dogma to Arnold's natural truth of religious feeling.

Where Eliot swerved from Arnold's position on literature and religion to the conservative right, Professor Trilling swerved from Arnold's socio-liberal position to the liberal left. Trilling felt that Arnold dealt inadequately with the problem of government; that is, how to place power and reason in the same agent. Trilling felt, too, as Whitman had, that Arnold's concern with urbanity neglected the earthy basis of life. Trilling has sought to go deeper than Arnold in these areas.

The terminus of Professor Raleigh's study, though not of Arnold's continuing influence, is about 1950. The book is not only a careful historical record of how Americans have read Arnold, but is also a study of what Arnold's thought has done and is doing in America. It is a valuable contribution for at least two reasons. It provides for the student both a discussion of Arnold's writings in terms of varied American reactions to them, and a study of the main lines of American opinion as they parallel or stem from Arnold. The book, though paper-backed, is handsomely produced, but it is a nuisance that the footnotes are placed at the back, where one must thumb to find the difference between an *ibid.* and a comment.

J. O. BAILEY

**Poe. A Critical Study.** By EDWARD H. DAVIDSON. Pp. xiv + 296. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 38s. net.

In his preface Professor Davidson anticipates many objections which might be made to his method of interpreting Poe's poems and tales. He there explains why, in a 'critical study' which neglects most of Poe's ephemeral critical writings and stresses unduly a few short poems and stories, he should devote more space to discussing philosophical rather than critical ideas. Mr. Davidson states quite frankly that his is a 'philosophical inquiry' based on two general critical theorems: the one, that concept of Romantic idealism which is familiar to students of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Emerson, and Poe; the other, a suggestion (derived from late nineteenth- and twentieth-century writers on aesthetics and symbolism) that 'art has a specific and autonomous function, both a part of and yet beyond the time and place in which it is formed'. Mr. Davidson claims—and the claim is essential to an understanding of his thesis and method—that Poe 'was

a "crisis" in the Romantic and symbolic imagination' (whatever such words may mean when torn from their context).

His method is partly chronological and partly thematic. He begins with the earliest poetry up to 1831. He then gives a theory of poetry and of the imagination in order to explain Poe's poetry and his ideas about poetry. There follow chapters on the later poetry ('The Raven'), the early short stories, the mature short stories, and finally on the philosophical prose-poem 'Eureka'. The volume ends with a 'Final Word' about Poe's place in American literature; and at several points in the analyses of particular works and in his various 'intercalary chapters' Mr. Davidson carefully fills in the literary background of Poe's American contemporaries. Finally, to correct any suggestion here that Mr. Davidson has selected certain poems in order to bolster up a preconceived theory, I should add that the notes to each chapter provide the reader with an excellent guide to the whole range of scholarship and criticism which has surrounded Poe's work during the last fifty years.

There are four central prongs to Mr. Davidson's exposition. First, he analyses the early poems in order to show (successfully, I think) that early in his career as a poet Poe was 'concerned not with what poetry says but with what poetry is'. Secondly, in a theoretical chapter on 'A Philosophy of Poetry' and a subsequent study of 'The Raven', he shows Poe's expression of, and response to, the major thought currents of his age. By pin-pointing the stages in the poet's struggle to reach a unitary vision 'wherein everything, prose and verse, real and unreal, mind and substance, somehow cohered', he makes it easier for the reader to accept his contention that 'The Raven' deals with a series of stages in the process of self-knowledge and ends with a 'virtual admission of universal disparity'. Thirdly, a close analysis of 'Arthur Gordon Pym' (following an interesting sociological study of early nineteenth-century necrolatry) strengthens Mr. Davidson's claim that though Poe had nothing to say in poetry after 1832, in his hands the short story became a prose-poem capable of expressing symbolically the poet's search for the principle of 'simplicity' which, he believed, lay behind the world of reality and the world of the imagination. Lastly, Mr. Davidson discusses 'Eureka', in accordance with Poe's own wish, as a poem and not, like some commentators, 'as the last maudlin ruminations of a diseased mind'. The author began his second chapter with the sentence, 'Poetry is a form of philosophy', and at the end of this section on 'Eureka' he pulls together all the threads of his argument and concludes that the poem demonstrates 'that knowledge was not science but intuition, that the artist must free himself from the empirical, and that the artist must admit to himself that he can pursue his "forlorn demon" alone or only in terms of the history of his art'.

Mr. Davidson's study, then, combines a scholarly interest in the genesis of a work of art with the peculiarly intense philosophical interest of many modern critics in their own personal relationship to any given work of art. The resulting tone is not harmonious, but despite much repetition—in style, subject-matter, and theme—his book is worth reading because it illuminates some twentieth-century attitudes to poetry and helps, in part, to explain the source of Poe's mastery of suspense, horror, and mystery. Even so, one major criticism might

be levelled at the method employed. Mr. Davidson's tenacious elucidation of the ideas which lie behind Poe's writings does not directly explain why his reputation still rests on those same tales of mystery. Of itself, the study of the climate of opinion in which a writer works cannot give a clear-cut answer to the question, 'What is the nature of that writer's finished work of art?' For while the scholar is testing the validity and relevance of the ideas of a past age to any writer's world picture, and the critic is frequently using those writings of a past age to interpret his (the critic's) own particular *angst*, the artist himself has selected from the thought complex of *his* age only those ideas which can be subordinated to the creative (and formal) needs of his own imaginative processes. So that at least part of the solution to the question, 'What did the artist really think or believe?', must inevitably reside in the patterns of art which he has created or the degree of intensity with which he seeks for such patterns. It is one merit of this book that it will make it easier for any 'formal critic' to decide whether Poe's lifelong philosophical search contributed anything to the success of his tales.

R. GEORGE THOMAS

**Joyce and Aquinas.** By WILLIAM T. NOON, S.J. Pp. xiv+168 (Yale Studies in English 133). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 30s. net.

**Joyce and Shakespeare. A Study in the Meaning of Ulysses.** By WILLIAM M. SCHUTTE. Pp. xiv+198 (Yale Studies in English 134). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1957. 32s. net.

The jacket of Father Noon's book, though not the title-page, bears the subtitle 'A study of religious elements in the writing of James Joyce'. Joyce in fact studied many religions and made bold use of their mythologies: Egyptian, Norse, Hindu, and other religious notions appear in his work, and each seems to be taken no more and no less seriously than those of Christianity or scientific rationalism. But the wealth of references to Roman Catholic liturgy and theology does cause special difficulties for the non-Catholic, who needs some guidance. Joyce was a star pupil of the Jesuits, and it is fitting that the first full account of his Thomism, and a very good one, should come from a Jesuit professor, who has supplemented it with a charitable and shrewd article in the *James Joyce Review*. He begins by giving the facts of Joyce's education. Joyce had no formal training in Scholastic philosophy; University College, Dublin, was one of the colleges which prepared students for the examinations of the Royal University, and the latter did not require any knowledge of Aquinas or of any other Scholastic. When Joyce claimed that he had been 'steeped in the school of old Aquinas' and based his famous aesthetic discussion in the *Portrait* on the Saint's words, he had only private reading behind him; if his brilliant constructions have a shaky foundation in Scholasticism, his Jesuit teachers are not to be blamed.

All this is an excellent negative start to the discussion, and a reviewer who has less than a pennyworth of Thomism can only mention respectfully some of Father Noon's other points. It is not clear that there is any Thomist aesthetic

at all; when Aquinas discusses beauty, it is usually in a Trinitarian context; the arts which he there uses as illustrations are almost always architecture and sculpture, and he does not give literature the status of these arts, treating it rather as a branch of rhetoric. Joyce's aesthetic appears to have owed almost as much to Berkeley and to Hegelian Romanticism as to Aquinas; but in his definition of 'claritas' Stephen Dedalus does give 'the most satisfactory interpretation of Aquinas' thought'. There is an excellent chapter on the term 'epiphany', which Joyce introduced to literary criticism but left ambiguous: does it mean the 'self-disclosure' of an object, in a 'sudden, spiritual manifestation', or the symbolic meaning given to an object by the artist? Father Noon, who probably knows more about Aquinas and aesthetics than Joyce did, is able to clear up some of the difficulties, and incidentally to trace this curious word to the 'épiphénomène esthétique' used by De Wulf in a Thomist study. Other chapters deal intelligently with the Trinitarian Fatherhood theme which is so important in *Ulysses*, and with the analogy Joyce draws between the artist and the God of Creation.

Father Noon is a skilful follower of the Yale theorists (W. K. Wimsatt was his research supervisor); in his remarks on the symbolic structure of *Dubliners* he shows himself to be a sensitive critic. His book is nevertheless heavy going, since, like many dissertations, it has been written to impress the examiners rather than to spread 'claritas'. His account of *Ulysses* is conventional and lacking in original discoveries, and he sees little of interest in the sterling humanist virtues of Leopold Bloom. In his chapter on *Finnegans Wake* he keeps even more closely to beaten ground, and apart from a suggestive allusion to Isidore's *Etymologies* (a medieval authority for the use of the pun) adds little to the commentators. An account of Joyce's drastic handling of Catholic theology in that work is still to seek; it will need more close exegesis and audacity than this book offers. On Joyce's early work, however, it is sympathetic and authoritative.

Dr. Schutte's work provides a complete contrast. It shows detailed scholarship and is full of discoveries that will please devoted readers of *Ulysses*. He is particularly good at identifying quotations, and not only Shakespearian ones. In an appendix he has traced almost every part of Stephen Dedalus's Library oration on Shakespeare to its source: the main authorities for this biographical theory turn out to be Brandes, Lee, and the disreputable Frank Harris, but Stephen (we need not say Joyce) deliberately distorted his reading. A gap, however, has been left by Dr. Schutte's failure to explore Mallarmé's views on *Hamlet*; for, as Kenner and Hayman have shown, Joyce took Mallarmé very seriously. The centre of the book is an analysis of the 'Scylla and Charybdis' chapter, which is admirably thorough. Dr. Schutte gives Bloom more of his due than Father Noon does, and works out the ludicrous parallels drawn by Joyce between Bloom and Shakespeare most convincingly. But his critical approach to the larger issues raised by *Ulysses* is unsatisfactory, especially in the first chapter, 'the current status [? read *state*] of Joyce criticism'. This scores a few hits, but shows an undue scepticism about earlier critics like Budgen, Gilbert, and Edmund Wilson, of whom Joyce seems rightly to have approved. In place of inter-



pretations which he claims to have demolished, Dr. Schutte has little to offer but banalities, e.g. 'But the failure of Bloom and Stephen to communicate should not be taken as an indication that they do not between them carry the potentialities for the regeneration of their common life in Ireland. If they could act, if they could communicate, they might make a new and healthy world' (p. 15). That explanation of 'the meaning of *Ulysses*' reduces Joyce's vast comic vision to the level of a sermon that combines the matter and style of J. Alexander Dowie and Gerty MacDowell.

M. J. C. HODGART

**Essays in Poetry mainly Australian.** By VINCENT BUCKLEY. Pp. x+198. Melbourne: University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1957. 30s. net.

Mr. Buckley is the most perceptive of the younger Australian literary critics. His achievement in this book is a measure of the new attitudes to Australian writing which are being engendered in Australian universities. Mr. Buckley, unlike past critics, is not unsure about a colony's ability to produce its own literature; nor is he brashly nationalistic, interested in no literature outside the boundaries of a new, fast-developing nation. He is highly intelligent, sensitive and discerning: he aims at setting Australia's poetry in a larger canvas of literature. This is a lively, indeed a stimulating, book; because it is so full of good ideas and such humanist idealism, it is a pity that it should be marred by the presence of undeniable beta quality. The reader has to make too many reservations, however sympathetic he is to Mr. Buckley's implicit, even obliquely edifying, Christian thesis. This is especially so in the first six chapters of the book, which, like the beginning of one of Sir Walter Scott's novels, could be jettisoned without much loss. Unfortunately they cannot be completely ignored by the reviewer, and before commenting on them the merits of the other essays on the work of five Australian poets, Slessor, Fitzgerald, Hope, Judith Wright, and Macauley should be stressed.

The first chapters are often contradictory. Mr. Buckley lays down directions—'I cannot see any other lines on which our poetry can continue to grow' (p. 20), yet 'What is now possible in Australian poetry I simply do not know' (p. 50). He belabours those who do not conform to his desiderata. For instance, when Mr. Buckley refers to the Sitwells as 'intolerable' (p. 34) we are reminded of the extravagance of undergraduate writing, until by p. 98 we realize that this label has presumably been licked and stuck on because 'either with witty inconsequence or with prophetic pretentiousness' they refuse to face the issue which Mr. Buckley thinks Yeats posed to himself. Yeats, incidentally, suffers from Mr. Buckley's frenzied finger-pointing at sex when on p. 95 we are told that 'the most powerful' of his last poems, though which poems are meant is not made clear, 'derive much of their anguish from an attempt to recreate the world in terms of his own sexual aspiration'.

Mr. Buckley writes (p. 84): 'An age which claims Dr. Sitwell as a great poet may be prepared to admit that she is also a representative one'; he also writes (p. 95):



'An age which does not protest against the exaltation of Christopher Fry to the status of a great artist is heading for a state in which art becomes lost in entertainment.' Mr. Buckley's scholarship is lost in shadow-boxing on these occasions. He can hit rather wildly too, as when he writes (p. 48) that advanced cosmopolitanism is gone 'and Harris with it'. Mr. Max Harris, who is indirectly attacked for a piece of foolish criticism on p. 107, has since written polished, witty poems, quite unlike the kind of thing Mr. Buckley is attacking, and of which he should not be ignorant.

While Mr. Buckley is acute in demonstrating the faults of what he calls vitalism—the paganism and self-consuming sensuousness of McCrae, Lindsay, and Slessor (to whom he does less than justice)—he overdoes his attack on the Anglicism of the nineteenth-century poets. What they were unfortunate in was not their sense of exile but their literary models. When he writes of Kendall's pre-Raphaelite poetry (p. 6) he overlooks the Wordsworthianism of this poet. He is often too concerned to place poetry into a particular mould he has cast for it, and sometimes it simply will not fit. What happens then is that his criticism runs into the danger of seeming either priggish or ruthless. There is no scope in the mould for light-hearted poetry; and sometimes there is failure to discriminate between important poetry and trivial because all of it is treated equally portentously. Mr. Buckley arms himself with a battering ram to crush some nettles: he might have been more effective against these dwarfish left-wing writers with a walking stick (pp. 52–69). Again he exhibits symptoms of provincialism in his suspicions of a new *Bulletin* school (pp. 70–78). His chapter on Poetry and the 'New Christians' is the most original of the first six chapters; in contrast, the chapter on Helicon as Jordan serves up far too many platitudes.

What is wrong with these chapters? Their nimbleness is checked by safety catches: the bullet too often remains snug in its subtle breach. Mr. Buckley is too oblique for clarity. He names four poets and says coyly (p. 95) that three of them are great artists, without saying which. He writes carelessly: things are 'tremendously important'; apart from clichés like 'meaningful' he uses 'conceptualize' and 'aestheticized' though he admits the latter to be a barbarous coinage. The real trouble is that he realizes some of his faults and doesn't do anything to remove them. It is not enough to write 'such a series of generalizations may seem to express no more than the usual paranoia of the literary critic; yet generalizations are necessary if one is to pose any case at all'. They have to be much more carefully considered, more closely argued, more tentatively put than they are in this book. Again, 'Examples could be given, but they would prove nothing; the generalization which I am making is too wide—though it would be proper to insist that I do not intend it to be an all-inclusive one' (p. 102). This kind of critical writing is not saved by the breathless parenthesis. When Mr. Buckley attacks, sensibly enough, what he calls vegetative mysticism, he immediately checks himself instinctively with 'and it is not to be entirely rejected'. The impression is thus created of a glib superficiality which is not really characteristic of Mr. Buckley's thought: the damage it does is to make the reader wonder, when he reads on pp. 78, 90, 92, 100 (possibly on pp. 24 and 44 also) of the virtues of Brennan, Macauley, Stewart, and occasionally Judith

Wright, the mother confessor, whether these asides can be substantiated. It may perhaps be significant that Brennan and Stewart are not dealt with in detail, that estimation of Macauley's merits is more hesitant than hopeful, and that discussion of Judith Wright's work is very cautious. Why choose 'Bullocky' for analysis? It is so well known, and the merits of her local history poems and her ancestor poems have been too long neglected. F. H. Mares's article 'Judith Wright and Australian Poetry' in the *Durham University Journal*, N.S., xix (1958), is a much more useful piece of criticism.

When after reading and rereading this provocative book the Preface is examined again the flaws are all too clear. The essays, Mr. Buckley blandly tells us, were not written at the same time and under the same conditions:

Some were written as I felt a personal need to write them; some were written to editorial requirements; some were prepared to be delivered as lectures. Therefore, they repeat and overlap each other; many considerations are left out which might otherwise have gone in; certain worthwhile poets are omitted, or have been treated more cursorily than I like.

This fact, which has had an influence on their content, has influenced their form as well. Some of them bear the marks of their origin as lectures, marks which only a deep incision could have cut out; others are as obviously written to the requirements of magazine publication. Such details are no doubt minor, and I mention them in order to forestall misunderstanding.

Some of the details seem to me to be major not minor. Mr. Buckley offers us in this costly book the inconclusive statements of a number of lectures and articles spread over a period of years without taking the trouble to revise them. His undoubted critical ability will never emerge at its full strength until he can use the file on himself as well as the scalpel on others.

A. NORMAN JEFFARES

**The Art of Drama.** By RONALD PEACOCK. Pp. vi+264. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957. 25s. net.

Aesthetics has generally been, in the past, the product of the colonizing ambitions of the large philosophic empires, empires primarily metaphysical and mostly idealist. Although Professor Peacock disclaims such systematic intentions, what he presents is a general aesthetics, the colony, but without the empire to support it. His primary aim is the familiar desire of the aesthetician to discover behind all the forms of art the *unum necessarium*. Rejecting the word 'symbol' as too narrow (even in Langer's usage!) he proceeds to define art in terms of 'imagery'. The exposition of this key concept suffers rather from the author's haste to get to the heart of his subject and one really needs the help of Sartre's *The Psychology of Imagination*. Quite distinct psychologically from the object of perception, the image is a relation between consciousness and an 'unreal' object. In art it is provided with a material analogue, but the image, which *is* the 'work of art', remains mental. Mr. Peacock deals with three sorts of image: the 'scientific

copy-image' which is denotative and non-artistic; the 'representational image' partly denotative, partly expressive; the expressive formula-image, a vocabulary of signs without literal significance as in music, or an arbitrary use of objects as signs of emotion. 'Art is experience re-enacted as idea, a formula of imagery, or imagery-within-language, being the instrument of re-enactment' (p. 67). This 're-enactment' is presumably what Sartre calls a material analogue. Thus though the arts differ in the media of their imagery, their unity consists not only in sharing this common principle but in the fact that the image itself is idea, thought (pp. 74, 81, 152). When, in the last third of the book, Mr. Peacock comes to grips with his titular subject, drama is then examined in terms of its characteristic 'intertexture' of imagery. 'Persons', gesture, speech, décor, plot, are treated as a fusion of the representational and the expressive formula-image. Cocteau's *poésie de théâtre* provides a useful model to confirm his terms.

These last ninety pages are so sensible and so full of discernment that one regrets the 'preoccupation with fundamentals' which detains the author so long. Most interesting is his argument that since the medium of drama is 'persons acting' the representative element has to be strong, the abstract and symbolic being generally unsatisfactory. Drama 'is the anthropomorphic form *par excellence*'; 'Its natural themes are psychology and morals' (pp. 180, 181). This is a plausible position especially when it is made within no narrow realist frame, though, of course, the forms of oriental drama would seem to cast doubt on it. What is puzzling, however, is whether this really means that drama tells us more of life. In terms of his system the representational image, though it incorporates more of real life, incorporates it as structure and therefore need not tell or assert any more of life than the expressive formula-image. He is plainly attracted by the moral and psychological subject-matter, yet it is part of the medium and in the end the medium is slighted: '... to the artist it is everything, and yet it is but an instrument of the imagination' (p. 152). Art is 'idea'. The strange gleams of Croceanism here are not, however, Croce at all, but Sartrean psychologism. There is a somewhat banal sense in which an aesthetic experience may be said to be 'thought', but not what it is an experience *of*. This banality is not entirely Mr. Peacock's meaning, but it seems needlessly confusing to insist on a distinction between a mental 'object' and a real object which makes no difference to the way we talk about them.

The most suspect part of his whole argument, however, concerns the unity of the arts. The evidence he is prepared to accept for such unity is itself specious and unconvincing—for example, the statement that poetry can 'approach the condition of music'. 'By virtue of a principle common to them all we can say of a poem: this is poetry, this is art, this is a kind of music; or of a piece of music, it is art, it is a kind of poetry . . .' (pp. 151-2). This is surely a blindness to the metaphoric mode in which such (thoroughly silly) expressions are used. Again in the interests of unity, the semantic confusions of *Dichtung* are brought in to 'broaden' the notion of the 'poetic' which is then associated with "'art" altogether' (p. 217). 'Poetry' then becomes an honorific term associated with profundity, morality, and insight. Even verse has improbable moral connotations: 'The play in verse . . . however much violent action it retains . . . contains prin-

cially an inner drama of feeling and motive in morally and spiritually sensitive persons and develops it in an elaborate and subtle language' (p. 225).

It is difficult not to feel that this whole manœuvre, basing itself on an essentialist interpretation of the word 'Art', is based on a fallacy. What the opening argument in the first paragraph of the Introduction succeeds in bringing out of its logical thicket is that a class of things (Arts) shares a common essence throughout its members. This is an instance of the belief that, as Ryle puts it, 'all the MacTavishes in the world must belong to the family of MacTavishes who live next door'. What we may have is a number of features occurring in different sets, as Wittgenstein's short instructive paragraph on games suggests. Moreover, even if it is possible to discover or impose a single principle throughout the entire class, the similarities thus exhibited are inevitably in terms either of such triviality or such high generality that they are simply not operable. Thus while Mr. Peacock's thesis seems to offer a wider and more general concern with the dramatic components than, for example, Wilson Knight's 'expanded metaphor', when it comes to *talking about a play* there is no question that, despite its verbal monism, Knight's formulation is a good deal more useful—more, in fact, gets said. And in the end, in all fruitful discussions of the arts it is not similarities but differences one really has to talk about.

JOHN A. M. RILLIE

***The Tenth Muse. Essays in Criticism.*** By HERBERT READ. Pp. xii+332. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1957. 25s. net.

'We must not be intimidated because we are in a minority.' Indefatigably receptive of minority opinions, Sir Herbert Read has no rival as an expositor of the characteristic formations of modern thought in its relation to the arts, and therein lies the chief value of this book to readers of this journal. The essays on purely literary subjects are often very good; those on Goethe and Pater, though too brief, are excellent, and there are valuable studies of Pound and 'The Image in Modern Poetry'. But Sir Herbert is at his best elsewhere in these forty stimulating pieces: for example, in the essays on Gabo and Barbara Hepworth. The virtue of his method lies in his readiness to assimilate disparate ideas and experiences; for instance, a review of Professor Ayer's *The Problem of Knowledge* not only draws a parallel between the modern philosopher and Aquinas, but considers what Ayer chose to leave out (the psychology of memory and perception, knowledge communicated by symbolic modes) and whether his account ought to be supplemented from Gestalt psychology and the new philosophies of symbolic form. A place must be found for art, without which, quite simply, we perish. Sir Herbert's interest in the work of Cassirer and Mrs. Langer, the impact of which has so far been curiously limited in this country, is very characteristic; for theirs is the latest version of the Romantic aesthetic.

A list of the thinkers who have most influenced Sir Herbert would look, at first sight, somewhat random: Diderot, Sterne, Coleridge, Ruskin, Nietzsche, Jung, the Symbolistes, Worringer, Hulme, Pound, Collingwood, D'Arcy Thompson, Cassirer. But all these writers have helped to enrich what must,

however unsatisfactorily, be called 'Romantic' thought, and the scientist is there because the latest phases of that thought have learnt so much from *Growth and Form*. For all its eclecticism, Sir Herbert's mind is a very original one, and defies all labels save 'Romantic'; unless, to be specific at the expense of euphony, one calls him 'neo-organicist', and that would have to be understood to include a visionary quality which has persisted without intermission in English Romantic thought since Blake. Blake, for some reason, is not often mentioned in this book, though his doctrine of the identity of conception and execution is essential to Sir Herbert's aesthetic.

Literature, for Sir Herbert, is a formative, not a rhetorical activity; this is the Romantic rule under which we still live, and which has produced, he believes, an incomparable literature. Its product is an image immediately intuited, and not of the phenomenal world; it may be compared to a mandala, the object of timelessly serene contemplation. This way of thinking has been buttressed by the modern discovery of primitive art, which Sir Herbert dates from 1889; the curious may care to consider the implications of a coincidence here, for Bergson's *Les Données immédiates de la conscience* belongs to the same year. Worringer's thesis, so important to the author, was written not so much later. Whether the talk, in this book, is of Hulme or D'Arcy Thompson or Lloyd Wright or Gabo or *tachisme*, the word 'organic' is never long absent from it, for Sir Herbert regards it as representing the most persistent and fundamental ingredient of Romantic thought from Coleridge (or his German sources) to the present day. The cultivation of the 'organicist' image is what, given the *Zeitgeist*, makes art possible.

Sir Herbert has a good deal to say about the *Zeitgeist*; he distinguishes it, not to one's entire satisfaction, from something better which we have lost, called 'social consciousness'. This was characteristic of medieval culture; in short, modern Romantic art has to supply the place formerly filled by Catholicism. 'As Schelling claimed, the immanent spirit of the universe is manifested through poetry, including the plastic arts and music. Poetry has thus the role of revelation in this immanent religion, and the only universal philosophy of poetry, since the Middle Ages, gives to the poet the priest-like function of mediation.' The result is a poetry which is not 'our daily bread'; it is necessarily 'fragmented, personal, spasmodic'. But this is the poetry we deserve, and what the *Zeitgeist* allows. It is interesting that Sir Herbert's characterization of 'our own *Zeitgeist*' would serve very well, if one changed the examples, for the eighteen-nineties. He finds four characteristics: Egoism (subjectivism in art); Erethism (excessive excitation of the sensibility); Eclecticism ('mythological salads' like *The Waste Land* and *Guernica*); and Escapism ('denial of the tragic sense of life').

But Sir Herbert is not really a critic from whose work a doctrine can be abstracted. His aim is 'not simply to be, but rather to be ever capable of becoming—not at rest, but moving with the moving world—always in touch with what is changing, changing oneself—open, like a child, to the whole world without, but with an inward reserve which the child does not yet possess, where one gathers a little strength, a certain order'. Because Sir Herbert has gathered a certain order we have here that rare thing, a volume of occasional essays which

is a whole book because every piece is informed by the same spirit, an exceptionally pure intellectual curiosity.

FRANK KERMODE

**Studies in Bibliography. Vol. XI.** Edited by FREDSON BOWERS. Pp. iv+298. Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1958. \$6.00.

This volume shows the variety and excellence that we have come to expect from these annual offerings from the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia. It sweeps from the description of an incunable in the Morgan Library to a bibliography of Nathanael West, who was born in this century and whose *Collected Works* were printed in 1957. It contains important contributions on matters of printing and publication in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as American matters like the financing of early sermons in New England and an account of Benjamin Franklin's Philadelphia Type, which is lavishly illustrated with twenty-four full-page plates. There is a great diversity in the material and its presentation, from the urbane and agreeable style of Robert Halsband's very interesting discussion on the problems of editing literary correspondence to the technicalities of the statistical procedures supported by the evidence of elaborate tabulation to prove that it was not unusual for a printer at the end of the sixteenth century to set by formes in printing Quartos. There are not many readers (or reviewers) whose minds can easily stretch so far and so wide, but there are few who will not find here much that is original and stimulating. For example, the article just referred to brings fresh evidence which cannot be set aside to show that we must be prepared to accept as a not uncommon practice the setting by formes. It is obvious that in verse the casting-off manuscript copy would not be too difficult, and in a small printing-house it might be very important to use every method to keep the compositor and the press-man working closely together. Similarly, the very careful study of the habits of the two compositors in setting the Folio text of *Henry VIII* is made good use of to support the view that they were using a fair copy that had been made from foul papers. The same minute investigation of the linguistic characteristics of Fletcher and his collaborator in the 1634 Quarto of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* seems to show that we may need to modify the generally accepted view that the printed text was set from prompt-copy. The evidence here produced seems to make it much more likely that the copy consisted of annotated foul papers; and the author suggests that 'it is quite possible that the play had to be written and put together under some pressure, so that it might be on the stage before the festivities attendant upon the wedding of Elizabeth and Frederick were over'.

We need to have considerable enthusiasm for this sort of thing to read straight on through the following twenty pages which contain the third of a series of studies by Cyrus Hoy on *The Shares of Fletcher and his Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. The elaborate tables which give the results of the count



scene by scene of the twelve plays, showing the use of such linguistic forms as *ye y' 'ee you, hath doth, 'em 'um them, &c.*, are proof enough of the immense amount of labour involved in such an investigation, and may perhaps justify the printing of all the evidence as well as the argument. But I confess that the tendencies here shown to extend the argument and lay out so much space on the exposure of the evidence raise the question whether it may not be possible to devise methods by the help of the statisticians or perhaps better by going straight to the mathematicians, so that the results of these calculations could be set down more succinctly. The unwinding of these tortuous arguments is so burdened by cautionary phrases and warning devices—'it would be difficult to determine whether or not'—'his tendency to use to a marked degree'—'it is reasonably good evidence for regarding'—that many readers would be grateful if in future the editor would insist that his contributors should provide an abstract of their theses, from which the aim and end would be more immediately apparent.

To complete the studies of plays there is a lively account of the dramatic piracies of 1661, which on typographic evidence are all proved very definitely to have been printed by Thomas Johnson for Kirkham and his group, including a folio copy of the *Beggars Bush*.

William B. Todd provides a masterly analysis of the five impressions of the First Edition of Goldsmith's *The Good Natur'd Man* and the six impressions of his *She Stoops to Conquer*, and gives a very plausible explanation of the confusion in the printing of the latter owing to the division of the job between two shops. He has examined a large number of copies which are arranged in order as they exemplify the variant states within the impressions. Any mere editor of a popular author in the eighteenth century may well be frightened by the complexities of this story of printing practice; and he should feel the need of the expert bibliographer to go ahead and solve such problems for him, before he begins to print his text.

The editor of a full critical edition with variants of Coleridge's *Poems* will in like manner be grateful for the listing of Unrecorded Variants from the various newspaper printings; and there is some good material for the critic who wishes to watch Coleridge at work reshaping some of his lines.

There remain in addition to some very interesting shorter notes, including the reproduction of a proof sheet from Nicholas Okes's shop, and the check list for 1956, which though selective is admirably full, two important longer studies on Publishing history. Cyprian Blagden has drawn from the Stationers' Company records a great deal of fresh information about the printing of Almanacks, the numbers sold, the costs of paper, printing, and authors' fees, and the profits to the partners, giving figures for the years 1664-70 and 1685-7. The numbers remain in total rather surprisingly steady throughout the period, and he estimates that the annual profit on over 300,000 copies must have been at least £1,500, and that it probably remained until well into the second half of the nineteenth century 'a pretty commoditie toward an honest mans lyving'. Richard Altick gives an account of the development of the cheap reprint from Aldine to Everyman during the period 1830 to 1906—a fascinating subject which has here brought out much valuable information, though it might perhaps have been



communicated with less verbosity. That can be the only reason why in this very carefully proof-read volume there is surely a textual error in the middle of the second paragraph of the first page.

These volumes of *Studies in Bibliography* have helped to encourage new and difficult techniques, and have changed the whole standard of modern bibliography. Their reputation is so firmly established that the editor might be urged to take advantage of his position and deal a little more rigorously with his contributors. Too many of them are busy men, who have not time to let their heady liquor settle and clarify itself. They and their readers would both be grateful if he would sometimes be a little more critical before accepting it as ready for the table.

HERBERT DAVIS

## SHORT NOTICES

**The Frame of Order. An Outline of Elizabethan Belief taken from Treatises of the Late Sixteenth Century.** Edited by JAMES WINNY. Pp. 224. London: Allen and Unwin, 1957. 26s. net.

By this time a number of mainly interesting and persuasive books have familiarized students of English literature with what may be generically called the 'Elizabethan (or Renaissance) World Picture'. However well informed and objective, these books must inevitably by paraphrase, summary, comment, or mere modernity of phrasing, temper or modify the strangeness of their material, even while they emphasize it. It is the object of this anthology of extracts to supplement these studies by enabling the student to sample for himself as much as he has time for of the 'literature of ideas' about Man, the State, and the Universe to which Shakespeare, Donne, and a host of avid contemporaries were exposed.

The need to provide maximum opportunity for this sampling within the limits of a practical book determines the method and scope of this Anthology. Editorial apparatus is cut to the bone. The introduction is heroically limited to twenty-six pages. There are no notes other than occasional footnotes giving a Biblical or classical reference or a word of laconic explanation. There is no index. Since, however, several of the authors riot in the resources of late Elizabethan vocabulary, there is a glossary. If the overriding aim were not respectable, one might regret the omission of brief biographical or historical notes to give the student-reader some idea of the usefulness of La Primaudaye or Louis Le Roy to their generation or of the extent to which Thomas Digges, for example, differs from most of the translators and compilers drawn upon.

The introduction deals briefly but (for the purpose) adequately with the long build-up of this *World of Ideas*. It achieves succinctness without being indigestible and finds space for some unhackneyed illustration and fresh historical and critical comment. It is neutral and judicious, lacking the nostalgia for the old *Frame of Order* which is conspicuous in some modern writings on the subject.

The book is well produced and pleasant in format. I have no means of checking the text, but I suspect a few misprints, in particular that the long *s* of the originals has sometimes disguised itself as 'f' (e.g. p. 30, 'spermaticke feed'). It is worth emphasizing that most of the material used would be really difficult of access to the majority of students.

G. D. WILLCOCK

**The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift. Vol. IV. A Proposal for Correcting the ENGLISH TONGUE, Polite Conversation, Etc.** Edited by HERBERT DAVIS with LOUIS LANDA. Pp. xl+310. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957. 30s. net.

I must confess I am upon another account under some Concern, which is, lest some of the following Papers are such as the Author perhaps would rather should not have been Published at all.

Such a doubt, simulated by the publisher of Swift's *Miscellanies in Prose and Verse* in 1711, must genuinely have troubled the editors of the latest volume of the collected prose works, for the punning trifles and fragmentary pieces included in the second part were merely the casual products of Swift's leisure. Though still capable of providing a little agreeable entertainment, it is only spasmodically that they catch the serious attention of the reader with shrewd observations and revealing anecdotes. In their pleasing intimacy there is at least evidence, almost charming in its way, of the more affable side of Swift's nature, his love of company, his lively spirits, not least his consideration for others: 'Few are qualified to *shine* in Company; but it is in most Mens Power to be *agreeable*'; 'Good Manners is the art of making every reasonable person in the company easy, and to be easy ourselves.' Positive precepts, however, are few, and an introductory observation on good manners, or sound education, gives place immediately to the castigation of their opposites. It was ever his way.

The more solid pieces in this miscellaneous gathering are all four of them well known, though in none of these either is Swift at his wittiest or wisest. Two of them are again occasional, his abstract in 'plain English' of Anthony Collins's *Discourse of Free-Thinking* and his sousing of Bishop Burnet's anti-Tory popery scare in his *Preface to the Bishop of Sarum's Introduction*. A third, the *Polite Conversation*, was compiled over many years and Swift must have had more fun in collecting these clichés of the would-be smart and witty than we can possibly get from reading them now. Apart from their suggestion of Swift's affiliations with Restoration comedy (a line of inquiry yet to be fully worked out), the dialogues are as tedious as their speakers are contemptible, and all the wit is confined to Swift's introduction, itself a more respectable document for the historian of language than the title piece of this volume, *A Proposal for Correcting the English Tongue*.

As Professor Davis rightly observes: 'The pieces brought together in this volume . . . are all the product of Swift's constant concern with language'; but the *Proposal*, which he valued most himself (it was the only one of his writings that he published under his own name), does least credit to his appreciation of the spirit of the English language. One feels certain that he would have been the first to revolt against the dictates of an authoritarian state Academy if Lord Oxford had found occasion to put Swift's proposition into practice. In this matter of language Swift was, as in so much else, conservatively rooted in the seventeenth century. Certainly there was little original, and much that might have been harmful, in his proposals for a reformation of the language. As far back as 1649 George Snell in his *Right Teaching of Useful Knowledge* had sought an official edict 'to ratify and settle the English language' on the model of the 'Grammatized and learned' Latin tongue. Fortunately the more prevalent acceptance of the mutability of living languages was all against it. Misguided as he was in this instance, and never himself immune from solecisms in grammar, Swift was genuinely seeking to give permanence, stability, and utility to English. It is a notable mark of his faith in his age and country. Those ends were better served by his own strenuous example as a writer and by his constant vigilance, evident throughout this volume, to curb the laxity of others.

COLIN J. HORNE

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

## ANGLIA

Band 77, Heft 1, 1959

- Dating O.E. *Genesis* and *Exodus* (E. B. Irving, Jr.), 1-11.  
 'Faithful Champion': The Theological Basis of Milton's Hero of Faith (J. M. Steadman), 12-28.  
 Swift und Berkeley (H. Papajewski), 29-53.  
 Rhythmical Ambivalence in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot (J. Levy), 54-64.  
 Anmerkungen zum *Middle English Dictionary* (H. Käsmann), 65-74.

## COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. xi, No. 1, Winter 1959

- Measure for Measure*: The Duke and the Prince (N. N. Holland), 16-20.  
 The New Criticism as an Historical Phenomenon (J. H. Raleigh), 21-28.  
 Spanish Drama in Neoclassical England (J. Loftis), 29-34.  
 Heroic Villains in Eighteenth-century Criticism (M. K. Danziger), 35-46.  
 Wallace Stevens: Some Relations between Poetry and Painting (M. Benamou), 47-60.

## ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xl, No. 3, June 1959

- Aldhelmus Glosatus III (R. Derolez), 129-34.  
 Problems of the History of English Grammar (G. Scheurweghs and E. Vorlat), 135-43.  
 Meaning and Structure in *Troilus and Cressida* (A. Gérard), 144-57.  
 Coleridge, Ernst Platner and the Imagination (W. Schrickx), 157-62.  
 Negative Contexts (E. Buyssens), 163-9.  
 Some Problems of the Vespasian Psalter (P. Mertens-Fonck), 170-3.  
 A Note on the Dirge in *Cymbeline* (F. Corin), 173-9.

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxii, No. 3, May 1959

- Thoreau's Canadian Notebook (L. Willson), 179-200.  
 American Literary Manuscripts in the Huntington Library (H. C. Schulz), 209-50.  
 Three Uncollected 'Leaves of Grass' (R. Asselineau), 255-9.  
 Mark Twain: An Unpublished Letter (S. L. Gross), 260-2.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxix, No. 4, April 1959

The Dying Swan: A Misunderstanding (F. McCulloch), 289-92.

A New Reading of a *Beowulf* crux [ll. 1030-1] (J. H. Friend), 292-3.

Chaucer and Isidore on Why Men Marry (R. A. Pratt), 293-4.

Watteau and the Poets (P. D. Edwards), 295-7.

A Source for the Motto to Poe's *William Wilson* (K. S. Rothwell), 297-8.

My Kinsman, Major Molineux: A Reading (T. E. Connors), 299-302.

A Yeats-Longfellow Parallel (W. Snow), 302-3.

Conrad's *Nostromo* as Boatswain (R. L. Cox), 303-6.

Captain Brant and Captain Brassbound [O'Neill] (D. M. Alexander), 306-10.

Form and Content in Empson's *Missing Dates* (R. D. Spector), 310-11.

Some Connotations of 'Cold' in O.E. and M.E. (V. Salmon), 314-22.

'Port the Helm' (W. P. Albrecht), 322-6.

Vol. lxxiv, No. 5, May 1959

Chaucer's Rosary and Donne's Bracelet; Ambiguous Coral (F. Manley), 385-8.

Ben Jonson and an Unknown Poet on the King's Senses (C. F. Main), 389-93.

Donne on the Mandrake (D. C. Allen), 393-7.

*Queen Mab*: The Inconsistency of Ahasuerus (W. H. Marshall), 397-400.

Tennyson's 'The Epic' (J. S. Lawry), 400-3.

Hawthorne: Mr. Hooper's 'Affable Weakness' (T. F. Walsh), 404-6.

*Typee* and Milton: Paradise Well Lost (R. Stanton), 407-11.

Vol. lxxiv, No. 6, June 1959

The Summoner's 'garleek, oynons, and eek lekes' (R. E. Kaske), 481-6.

Love in a Grave (D. C. Allen), 485-6.

The 'Arsenal' Proof Sheets of Pope's *Iliad* (R. M. Schmitz), 486-9.

*My Last Duchess* and *Parisina* (L. Stevenson), 489-92.

Arnold's Review of de Maistre's *Lettres et opuscules inédits* (F. Neiman), 492-4.

Dorothy Richardson and the Dilemma of 'Being versus Becoming' (S. K. Kumar), 494-501.

Bruscambille's Defense of the Theatre (W. L. Wiley), 502-7.

## MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY

Vol. xx, No. 1, March 1959

*Bartholomew Fair* and its Puppets (J. A. Barish), 3-17.  
 Dramatic Criticism in the *Critical Review*, 1756-85 (Part I) (C. E. Jones), 18-26.  
 Joyce's Epiphany and Bergson's 'L'Intuition philosophique' (S. K. Kumar), 27-30.  
 Emerson and Boehme (L. Braham), 31-35.  
 Erasmus A. Darwin, Friend of Thomas and Jane Carlyle (G. J. Calder), 36-48.

*Vol. xx, No. 2, June 1959*

Billy Budd: Testament of Acceptance (P. Withim), 115-27.  
 Keats's 'Mansions of Many Apartments', *Sleep and Poetry*, and *Tintern Abbey* (J. B. Severs), 128-32.  
 Dramatic Criticism in the *Critical Review*, 1756-85 (Part II) (C. E. Jones), 133-44.  
 Bibliography of Critical Arthurian Literature, 1958 (P. A. Brown), 145-66.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*Vol. liv, No. 3, July 1959*

Edward Phillips's *Compendiosa Enumeratio Poetarum* (R. G. Howarth), 321-8.  
 Meredith's 'Austrian Poets': A Newly Identified Review Essay (D. B. Green), 329-36.  
 Some Unpublished Shakespeare Notes of Ludwig Tieck (J. Trainer), 368-77.  
 Two Readings in *Hamlet* (H. Jenkins), 391-5.  
*Hamlet*, v. ii. 356 (J. C. Maxwell), 395-6.  
 Three New Hardy Letters (R. L. Lowe), 396-7.  
 T. S. Eliot and Sherlock Holmes (P. Preston), 397-9.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. lvi, No. 4, May 1959*

The Intangible Mistress (H. M. Richmond), 217-23.  
 Milton's Rhetoric (J. B. Broadbent), 224-42.  
 Johnson and Gray: A Study in Literary Antagonism (W. P. Jones), 243-53.  
 Coleridge's *The Plot Discovered*: Some Facts and a Speculation (L. Werkmeister), 254-63.  
 Arnold's Notebooks and Arnold Bibliography (R. H. Super), 268-9.  
 Chaucer's Modest and Homely Poem: the *Parlement* (T. Silverstein), 270-6.

NOTES AND QUERIES

*Vol. vi, N.S. No. 6, June 1959*

Fielding and Pope, 200-4.  
 Marvell's Friends in the City, 204-7.  
 Harriet Martineau in America, 207-8.  
 Donne and Kepler, 208-9.  
 The *Humours Heav'n on Earth* of John Davies of Hereford, and a Suppressed Poem, 209-10.

Conrad's Praise of Hergesheimer, 210.  
 19th-century Anonyma: Some Identifications, 210-12.  
 Charles Reade's Contract with Fields, Osgood and Co., 212.  
 An Incorrectly Attributed Speech-Prefix in Cibber's *Love's Last Shift*, 212-13.  
 Fielding and the 'trunk-maker', 213.  
 Protestant Existentialism of Christina Rossetti, 213-15.  
 Hopkins's 'skate's heel' in *The Windhover*, 215-16.  
 Locksley Hall and *Ivanhoe*, 216-17.  
 Webster and the *Book of Homilies*, 217-18.  
 New Molière Source for Steele's *The Tender Husband*, 218.  
 Dr. John Armstrong's *Of Benevolence*, 218-19.  
 Source of Henry V's Speech at Harfleur, 219-20.  
 Dalton's *Comus* Again, 220-1.  
 Comments on Shelley in *The Beacon* and *The Kaleidoscope* (1821), 224-6.  
 Solomon and Saturn II. 449 (Menner edition), 226-7.  
 Notes and Corrections on J. W. Beach's *The Making of the Auden Canon*, 227-8.  
 Herrick and Latin Authors, 231-2.  
 Shirley's *The Cardinal*, 232-3.  
 Rowland Watkins and Andrew Marvell, 234-5.  
 The Riddle Song in *The Merchant of Venice*, 235.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

*Vol. xxxviii, No. 1, January 1959*

Acrostics, Anagrams, and Chaucer (W. F. and E. S. Friedman), 1-20.  
 Chaucer as Librettist (M. Mudrick), 21-29.  
 Genre and *Tristram Shandy* (J. M. Stedmond), 37-51.  
 Dickens and Interior Monologue (H. Stone), 52-65.  
 Reynolds's Pendulum Figure and the Watchmaker (H. E. Gerber), 66-83.  
*Rasselas* and the Theme of Diversification (W. Kenney), 84-89.  
 Date of the John Phillips-John Milton *Joannis Philippi Angli Responsio* (R. W. Ayers), 95-101.  
 The Blind Beggar of Alexandria: A Reappraisal (H. A. Kaufman), 101-6.  
 MS. C.C.C.C. 201: A Note on its Character and Provenance (L. Whitbread), 106-12.  
 A 'De Excidio' Tradition in the Old English *Ruin*? (G. W. Dunleavy), 112-18.  
 The Concept of Order in the *Franklin's Tale* (E. B. Benjamin), 119-24.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

441

Chaucer and Two Elizabethan Pseudo-Sciences (C. Camden), 124-6.  
A Seriously Misdated Shelley Letter (F. L. Jones), 126.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

*Vol. lxxiv, No. 2, May 1959*

Annual Bibliography for 1958, 67-336.

*Vol. lxxiv, No. 3, June 1959*

The *Vespasian Psalter* Gloss: Original or Copy? (S. M. Kuhn), 161-77.

The *Romaunt of the Rose* and Source Manuscripts (R. Sutherland), 178-83.

Foscolo and Lord Holland's 'Letters of Petrarch' (E. H. Wilkins), 184-90.

Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods, 1659-60 (B. K. Lewalski), 191-202.

Thomas D'Urfey, the Pope-Philips Quarrel, and *The Shepherd's Week* (W. D. Ellis, Jr.), 203-12.

Fielding's *The Female Husband*: Fact and Fiction (S. Baker), 213-24.

Garrick's *Zara* (F. L. Bergmann), 225-32.

Beatrice's 'Pernicious Mistake' in *The Cenci* (R. F. Whitman), 249-53.

Background to *Modern Painters*: The Tradition and the Turner Controversy (V. A. Burd), 254-67.

## SEWANEE REVIEW

*Vol. lxxvii, No. 3, Summer 1959*

A Literary Correspondence (Part II) [Lawrence; James] (E. Dahlberg and Sir H. Read), 422-45.

## SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

*Vol. x, No. 1, Winter 1959*

Historical Criticism and the Interpretation of Shakespeare (R. Ornstein), 3-9.

Claudio, Bertram, and a Note on Interpretation (F. G. Schoff), 11-23.

Shakespeare's Plutarch (E. A. J. Honigmann), 25-33.

Romeo's Loquacious Friend (H. McArthur), 35-44.

Providence in Shakespeare's Yorkist Plays (M. Quinn), 45-52.

Coriolanus as Tragic Hero (H. J. Oliver), 53-60.

'What You Will': A Suggestion (S. Nagarajan), 61-67.

The Earl of Montgomery and the Dedicator Epistle of the First Folio (D. Taylor, Jr.), 121-3.

Desdemona and Dido (J. M. Major), 123-5.

Shylock's 'Wolvish' Spirit (R. Nash), 125-8.

Shakespeare Allusion in *Far From the Madding Crowd* (D. B. Green), 129.  
*Romeo and Juliet*, 1. iii. 89-90 (T. Culbert), 129-32.

*Vol. x, No. 2, Spring 1959*

The Background of *Coriolanus* (K. Muir), 137-45.

*Macbeth*: The Pattern of Idea and Action (I. Ribner), 147-59.

Music, and the Songs in *The Winter's Tale* (J. H. P. Pafford), 161-75.

*Comus* and *The Tempest* (J. M. Major), 177-83.

Musical Terms in *The Taming of the Shrew* (T. R. Waldo and T. W. Herbert), 185-99.

Elizabethan Acting in *Othello* (D. Seltzer), 201-10.

Brutus and the Death of Portia (B. Stirling), 211-17.

'Solid', 'Sullied', and Mutability (S. A. Weiss), 219-27.

'Like Two Spirits': Shakespeare and Ficino (J. M. Steadman), 244-6.

The Foresters' Song in *As You Like It* (P. J. Seng), 246-9.

*Hamlet* iv. v. 156-7 (G. W. O'Brien), 249-51.

New Analogue and Possible Source for *The Taming of a Shrew* (J. W. Shroeder), 251-5.

Shakespeare's Motley (S. Thomas), 255.

Annotated Shakespeare Bibliography for 1958, 259-331.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. lvi, No. 2, April 1959*

Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite (W. J. Ong, S.J.), 103-24.

Ascham's Theory of History Writing (W. F. Staton, Jr.), 125-37.

Young Anthony Mundy Again (C. T. Wright), 150-68.

'The King is not Himself': The Personal Tragedy of Richard II (M. Quinn), 169-86.

Daniel and Wordsworth (C. C. Seronsy), 187-213.

Adam and the Prophesied Redeemer [*Paradise Lost*, xii. 359-623] (J. M. Steadman), 214-25.

Literature of the Renaissance in 1958: A Bibliography, 227-452.

## VICTORIAN STUDIES

*Vol. ii, No. 4, June 1959*

Unity Through Analogy: An Interpretation of *Middlemarch* (D. R. Carroll), 305-16.

Victorian Bibliography for 1958, 351-92.

# LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

January—June 1959

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1959 the date of each publication.]

- ADAMS, R. M. *Strains of Discord: Studies in Literary Openness*. Ithaca, 1958; London. pp. x+220. 30s.
- ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Vol. XXX, 1950-52, ed. H. Pettit and A. Macdonald assd. by W. White. Cambridge. pp. xvi+752. 80s.
- ATKINSON, M. E. *August Wilhelm Schlegel as a Translator of Shakespeare*. Oxford. pp. x+68. 8s. 6d.
- BALD, R. C. *Donne and the Drurys*. Cambridge. pp. x+176. 30s.
- BALDWIN, M. *Poetry without Tears*. pp. xii+196. 14s.
- BARBIER, C. P. *Samuel Rogers and William Gilpin. Their friendship and correspondence*. pp. xiv+106. 16s.
- BARKER, R. H. *Thomas Middleton*. New York, 1958; London. pp. xii+216. 25s.
- BAUM, P. F. *Chaucer. A Critical Appreciation*. Durham, N.C., 1958; London. pp. xiv+230. 45s.
- BAUMGARTEN, S. *Le Crépuscule néo-classique*. Thomas Hope. Paris, 1958. pp. 272.
- BLACKSTONE, B. *The Consecrated Urn. An interpretation of Keats in Terms of Growth and Form*. pp. xvi+426. 45s.
- BLONDEL, J. *Milton Poète de la Bible dans le Paradis Perdu*. Paris. Vol. I, pp. 40; Vol. II, pp. 41-88. Fr. 250 each.
- BOND, R. P. (ed.). *New Letters to the Tatler and Spectator*. Austin. pp. xiv+232. \$5.00.
- BONJOUR, A. G. *The Structure of Julius Caesar*. Liverpool, 1958. pp. xii+82. 12s. 6d.
- BOWERS, F. *Textual and Literary Criticism*. Cambridge. pp. x+186. 22s. 6d.
- BRANDER, L. *Thackeray*. pp. 52. 2s. 6d.
- BRIGGS, K. M. *The Anatomy of Puck. An Examination of Fairy Beliefs among Shakespeare's Contemporaries and Successors*. pp. xii+284. 30s.
- BRODEUR, A. G. *The Art of Beowulf*. Berkeley; London. pp. xii+284. 34s.
- BRONSON, B. H. *The Traditional Tunes of the Child Ballads, with their Texts, according to the Extant Records of Great Britain and America*. Princeton; London. Vol. I, pp. xxxviii+466. £10.
- BROWNE, Sir T. *Une Version primitive de Religio Medici. Texte inédit de la copie manuscrite au Collège de Pembroke*. Oxford. ed. J.-J. Denonain. Algiers, 1958. pp. 108. Fr. 700.
- BRUNNER, K. *Abriss der mittellenglischen Grammatik*. [4th edn.] Tübingen. pp. viii+114. DM. 4.60.
- BRYSON, J. *Robert Browning*. pp. 44. 2s. 6d.
- BURNEY, C. *Musical Tours in Europe*, ed. P. A. Scholes. Vol. I, pp. xxxvi+328; Vol. II, pp. xii+268. £5. 5s.
- BUTLER, G. (ed.). *A Book of South African Verse*. pp. xlii+228. 18s.
- CAIRO STUDIES IN ENGLISH, ed. Magdi Wahba. Cairo. pp. 146.
- CHAMBERS, R. W. *Beowulf. An Introduction to the Study of the Poem*. 3rd edn. with Supplement by C. L. Wrenn. Cambridge. pp. xviii+628. 55s.
- COLERIDGE, S. T. *Selected Poems*, ed. J. Reeves. pp. xxxviii+154. 8s. 6d.
- CONRAD, J. *Letters to William Blackwood and David S. Meldrum*, ed. W. Blackburn. Durham, N.C., 1958; London. pp. xxxviii+210. 45s.
- CRUICKSHANK, J. *Albert Camus and the Literature of Revolt*. pp. x+250. 25s.
- CUTTS, J. P. (ed.). *Seventeenth Century Songs and Lyrics*. Columbia, Missouri. pp. x+460. \$6.00.
- DICKINSON, E. *Selected Poems*, ed. J. Reeves. pp. liv+114. 9s. 6d.
- DICTIONARY OF THE OLDER SCOTTISH TONGUE. Part XVIII, Knot-Law, ed. A. J. Aitken. pp. 481-600. 50s.
- DIGGES, L. (tr.). *Claudian. The Rape of Proserpine*, ed. H. H. Huxley. Liverpool. pp. xiv+82. 7s. 6d.
- DONNE, J. *Sermons*, ed. G. R. Potter and E. M. Simpson. Berkeley; London. Vol. IV, pp. x+420. 56s. 6d.
- DREISER, T. *Letters. A Selection*, ed. R. H. Elias. 3 vols., pp. 1068. Philadelphia; London. 144s.
- DUFF, Sir J. *Universities in Britain*. pp. iv+40. 2s. 6d.
- EMDEN, C. S. *Poets in their Letters*. pp. xii+232. 21s.



## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

443

- EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. The Salisbury Psalter, ed. C. Sisam and K. Sisam. pp. xii+312. 84s.  
 — The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey by G. Cavendish, ed. R. S. Sylvester. pp. xlii+304. 35s.  
 — The South English Legendary, ed. C. D'Evelyn and A. J. Mill. Vol. III, pp. xii+82. 25s.  
 ELLEGÅRD, A. Darwin and the General Reader. The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872. Göteborg, 1958. pp. 394. Kr. 28.00.  
 ENGLISH PLACE-NAME SOCIETY. The Place-Names of Derbyshire, by K. Cameron. Cambridge. Part I, pp. lxxiv+186; Part II, pp. viii+187-514; Part III, pp. viii+515-830. 35s. each.  
 FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY. Tudor and Stuart History. A Report of the Folger Library Conference on Needs and Opportunities. Washington, D.C. pp. 42.  
 FOWLER, D. C. Prowess and Charity in the *Perceval* of Chrétien de Troyes. Seattle. pp. viii+82. \$3.00.  
 FRYKMAN, E. John Galt's Scottish Stories 1820-1823. Uppsala. pp. 240. Kr. 20.  
 GARDNER, H. The Business of Criticism. Oxford. pp. x+158. 15s.  
 GARRETT, J. (ed.). More Talking of Shakespeare. pp. x+190. 21s.  
 GÉRIN, W. Anne Brontë. pp. xvi+368. 30s.  
 GOLDBERG, M. A. Smollett and the Scottish School. Albuquerque. pp. xiv+194. \$3.00.  
 GREEN, P. Sir Thomas Browne. pp. 40. 2s. 6d.  
 GUERARD, A. J. Conrad the Novelist. Cambridge, Mass., 1958; London. pp. xviii+322. 30s.  
 HARDY, B. The Novels of George Eliot. pp. xii+242. 25s.  
 HARRISON, A. and STANFORD, D. Anne Brontë. Her Life and Work. pp. 252. 25s.  
 HARWARD, V. J. The Dwarfs of Arthurian Romance and Celtic Tradition. Leiden, 1958. pp. x+150. 15 guilders.  
 HAZLITT, S. and W. Journals, 1822-1831, ed. W. H. Bonner. Buffalo. pp. 161-282. \$1.50.  
 HOPKINS, G. M. Journals and Papers, ed. H. House, compl. G. Storey. pp. xxxiv+580. 63s.  
 — Sermons and Devotional Writings, ed. C. Devlin. pp. xiv+370. 42s.  
 HUMPHREYS, A. R. Steele, Addison and their Periodical Essays. pp. 46. 2s. 6d.  
 HUPPÉ, B. F. Doctrine and Poetry. Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry. New York. pp. viii+248. \$6.00.  
 ISTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO ORIENTALE. Annali. Sezione Germanica, I. Napoli, 1958. pp. 300.  
 JAMES, D. G. Three Odes of Keats. Cardiff. pp. 24. 2s. 6d.  
 JEFFARES, A. N. Language Literature and Science. pp. ii+24. 2s. 6d.  
 — Oliver Goldsmith. pp. 44. 2s. 6d.  
 JEWKES, W. T. Act Division in Elizabethan and Jacobean Plays 1583-1616. Hamden, Conn. pp. x+374. \$6.50.  
 JONES, D. Epoch and Artist, ed. H. Grise-wood. pp. 320. 25s.  
 JONES, H. Men of Letters. pp. viii+184. 12s. 6d.  
 JOSEPH, B. The Tragic Actor. pp. xvi+416. 50s.  
 JOYCE, J. Critical Writings, ed. E. Mason and R. Ellmann. pp. 288. 25s.  
 KNIGHT, E. The Objective Society. pp. viii+136. 16s.  
 KURIYAGAWA, F. The Paris Manuscript of Walter Hilton's Eight Chapters on Perfection. Tokyo, 1958. pp. 21-56.  
 LEARY, L. (ed.). Contemporary Literary Scholarship. New York, 1958; London. pp. x+474. 42s.  
 LINDBERG, C. (ed.). MS. Bodley 959. Genesis-Baruch 3.20 in the Earlier Version of the Wycliffite Bible. Stockholm. Vol. I, pp. 214. Kr. 25.00.  
 McCORMICK, E. H. New Zealand Literature. pp. viii+174. 22s. 6d.  
 MAHEU, P.-G. La Pensée religieuse et morale de George Eliot. Paris. pp. 140.  
 MALONE, K. Studies in Heroic Legend and in Current Speech, ed. S. Einarsson and N. E. Eliason. Copenhagen. pp. xx+298. Kr. 48.  
 MASON, H. A. Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period. pp. viii+296. 32s.  
 MATTHIESSEN, F. O. The Achievement of T. S. Eliot. 3rd edn. with a chapter on Eliot's later work by C. L. Barber. New York; London. pp. xxiv+248. 25s.  
 MEECH, S. B. Design in Chaucer's *Troilus*. Syracuse, N.Y. pp. xii+530. \$10.00.  
 MERCHANT, W. M. Shakespeare and the Artist. pp. xxx+254. £5. 5s.  
 MORSE, J. M. The Sympathetic Alien. James Joyce and Catholicism. New York. pp. xii+170. \$4.00.  
 NEUMANN, E. Art and the Creative Unconscious. Four Essays, tr. R. Manheim. pp. x+232. 25s.



- NICHOLSON, I. *Firefly in the Night. A Study of Ancient Mexican Poetry and Symbolism.* pp. 232. 25s.
- OPPEL, H. *The Sacred River. Studien und Interpretationen zur Dichtung der englischen Romantik.* Frankfurt a.M. pp. 68. DM. 3.20.
- OXFORD COMPANION TO FRENCH LITERATURE, ed. Sir P. Harvey and J. E. Heseltine. Oxford. pp. x+772. 45s.
- PADEN, W. D. *La Pia de' Tolomei* by D. G. Rossetti. Lawrence, Kansas, 1958. pp. 48.
- PREYER, R. Bentham, Coleridge, and the Science of History. Bochum-Langendreer, 1958. DM. 15.00.
- PRIOR, M. *Literary Works*, ed. H. B. Wright and M. K. Spears. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. liv+722; Vol. II, pp. viii+723-1094. £6. 6s.
- RICE, E. F., Jr. *The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom.* Cambridge, Mass., 1958; London. pp. xvi+220. 38s.
- RILKE, R. M. *The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*, tr. M. D. Herter Norton. New York. pp. 238. \$1.15.
- ROSENBERG, I. 1890-1918. *Catalogue of an Exhibition held at Leeds University May-June 1959, together with the text of unpublished material.* Leeds. pp. ii+36. 7s. 6d.
- RYSKAMP, C. *William Cowper of the Inner Temple*, Esq. Cambridge. pp. xviii+276. 30s.
- SAUL, G. B. *Prolegomena to the Study of Yeats's Plays.* Philadelphia, 1958; London. pp. 106. 40s.
- SCOTTISH TEXT SOCIETY. *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. J. Craigie. Edinburgh, 1958. Vol. II, pp. xlvi+318.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *All's Well that Ends Well*, ed. G. K. Hunter. (Arden.) pp. lx+152. 18s.
- *Timon of Athens*, ed. H. J. Oliver. (Arden.) pp. lii+156. 18s.
- *Much Ado about Nothing*, ed. Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson. (Cambridge Pocket Shakespeare.) Cambridge. pp. 98. 5s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Richard the Third 1597*, ed. Sir W. Greg. (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles 12.) Oxford. pp. x+98. 25s.
- *Le Roi Henri VI, Deuxième Partie*, tr. F. Sauvage and A. Koszul. Paris. pp. xxiv+252.
- SHELLEY, P. B. *Prometheus Unbound.* Variorum edn., ed. L. J. Zillman. Seattle. pp. xx+792. \$15.00.
- STORRS, R. (ed.). *Ad Pyrrham. A Polyglot Collection of Translations of Horace's Ode to Pyrrha.* pp. xii+204. 25s.
- STREATFEILD, D. *Persephone. A Study of Two Worlds.* pp. vi+368. 30s.
- STROUP, T. B. (ed.). *Selected Poems of George Daniel of Beswick 1616-1657.* Lexington. pp. xxx+202. \$5.50.
- TAYLOR, C. H., Jr. *The Early Collected Editions of Shelley's Poems.* New Haven, 1958; London. pp. xiv+108. 32s.
- THOMPSON, C. R. *Schools in Tudor England.* Washington, 1958. pp. ii+38+12 plates. \$0.75.
- TULANE STUDIES IN ENGLISH. Vol. VIII, ed. A. Taylor. New Orleans, 1958. pp. 192. \$2.00.
- WALLERSTEIN, R. C. *Richard Crashaw. A Study in Style and Poetic Development.* [2nd printing.] Madison. pp. 160. \$1.25.
- WARD, A. C. *Gissing.* pp. 44. 2s. 6d.
- WASSERMAN, E. R. *The Subtler Language. Critical Readings of Neoclassic and Romantic Poems.* Baltimore. pp. vi+362. \$6.00.
- WHITEHEAD, A. N. *Modes of Thought.* [Reprint.] New York. pp. xii+242. \$1.15.
- WICKHAM, G. *Early English Stages 1300-1660.* Vol. I, 1300-1576. pp. xlv+428. 45s.
- WORDSWORTH, W. *The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind*, ed. E. de Selincourt. 2nd edn. revd. H. Darbishire. Oxford. pp. lxxiv+650. 75s.
- ZANCO, A. *Storia della letteratura inglese.* [2nd edn.] Vol. I, pp. xii+642. Vol. II, pp. vi+872. Torino, 1958.

# INDEX

Adrian, A. A., *Georgina Hogarth and the Dickens circle*, revd., 207.  
 Ælfric. See Harlow, C. G. (art.).  
 Agoa, H. S. See Montgomery, G.  
 Alexander. See Cary, G. (revd.).  
 Alfred, King, *The Pastoral Care*, tr. of St. Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis*, ed. N. R. Ker, revd., 72.  
 Anderson, M. L. (ed.), *The James Carmichael Collection of Proverbs in Scots*, revd., 194.  
 Anglo, S., art. by, William Cornish in a Play, Pageants, Prison, and Politics, 347.  
 Armstrong, J. See Roper, D. (art.).  
 Armstrong, W. A., art. by, The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres, 234.  
 Arnold, M. See Raleigh, J. H. (revd.); Tillotson, K. (noticed).  
 Bald's *Leechbook*, ed. C. E. Wright with appendix by R. Quirk, revd., 72.  
 Baldwin, T. W., *Shakespeare's 'Love's Labor's Won'*, revd., 412.  
 Bazire, J. See *Chastising of God's Children. Benedictine Office, The. An Old English Text*, ed. J. M. Ure, revd., 75.  
 Benkovitz, M., art. by, Dr. Burney's *Memoirs*, 257.  
 Bennett, J. A. W., *'The Parlement of Foules'. An Interpretation*, revd., 404.  
 Bethurum, D. (ed.), *The Homilies of Wulfstan*, revd., 294.  
 Blackstone, W. See Philip, I. G. (noticed).  
 Blake, W., *'Vala'. Blake's numbered Text*, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, revd., 92.  
 — See Digby, G. W. (revd.).  
 Bloom, E. A., *Samuel Johnson in Grub Street*, revd., 201.  
 Boccaccio. See Wright, H. G. (revd.).  
 Boklund, G., *The Sources of 'The White Devil'*, revd., 89.  
 Boswell, J. See de Beer, E. S. (art.).  
 Bowers, F. See Dekker, T.; *Studies in Bibliography*.  
 Bowyer, T. H., *A bibliographical examination of the earliest editions of the Letters of Junius*, noticed, 217.  
 Brand, C. P., *Italy and the English Romantics. The Italianate Fashion in Early Nineteenth-Century England*, revd., 205.  
 British Academy, *Proceedings*. See Tillotson, K.  
 Browne, J., *The Marchants Avizo*, ed. P. McGrath, noticed, 329.  
 Buckley, V., *Essays in Poetry mainly Australian*, revd., 429.  
 Bullough, G. (ed.), *The Narrative and Dra-*

*matic Sources of Shakespeare*, Vol. I, Early Comedies, Poems, *Romeo and Juliet*, revd., 303.  
 Bunyan, J., *A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. J. B.* See Sharrock, R. (art.).  
 Burney, C., *Memoirs*. See Benkovitz, M. (art.).  
 Butt, J., and Tillotson, K., *Dickens at Work*, revd., 98.  
 Cairncross, A. S. See Walton, J. K.  
 Carlyle, T. See Tillotson, K. (noticed).  
 Carmichael, J., 'Collection of Proverbs'. See Anderson, M. L. (revd.).  
 Cary, G., *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D. J. A. Ross, revd., 190.  
 Caxton, W. See *Paris and Vienne* (revd.).  
*Chastising of God's Children, The, and The Treatise of Perfection of the Sons of God*, ed. J. Bazire and E. Colledge, revd., 298.  
 Chaucer, G., *The Parlement of Foules*. See Bennett, J. A. W. (revd.); *Canterbury Tales*. See Tucker, S. I. (note); *The Wife of Bath's Tale*. See Eisner, S. (revd.).  
 Chettle, H., *Piers Plainness*. See Winny, J. (noticed).  
 Child, F. J. (ed.), *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, noticed, 328.  
 Christ Church MS. Mus. 87. See Cutts, J. P. (art.).  
 Clemens, W., *Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III. Interpretation eines Dramas*, revd., 304.  
 Clough, A. H., *The Correspondence of A. H. C.*, ed. F. L. Mulhauser, revd., 311.  
 Coburn, K. See Coleridge, S. T.  
 Coleridge, S. T., *The Notebooks of S. T. C.*, Vol. I, 1794-1804, ed. K. Coburn, revd., 203.  
 Colledge, E. See *Chastising of God's Children*.  
 Conrad, J., *Nostramo*. See Halverson, J. (art.); Haugh, R. F.; Moser, T. (revd.).  
 Cooling, J., note by, *An Unpublished Middle English Prologue*, 172.  
 Cornish, W. See Anglo, S. (art.).  
*Craft of Veneray*. See Tilander, G. (noticed).  
*Critical Review*. See Roper, D. (art.).  
 Croker, J. W. See de Beer, E. S. (art.).  
 Crow, J. See *Jacob and Esau*.  
 Cutts, J. P., art. by, 'M<sup>rs</sup> Elizabeth Dauenant': Christ Church MS. Mus. 87, 26.

Dalziel, M., *Popular Fiction 100 Years Ago*, revd., 422.  
 Davidson, E. H., *Poe. A Critical Study*, revd., 425.

- d'Ardenne, S. R. T. O., art. by, 'The Green Count' and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, 113.
- Davenant, E. See Cutts, J. P. (art.).
- Davis, H. See Swift, J.
- de Beer, E. S., art. by, Macaulay and Croker: the Review of Croker's Boswell, 388.
- Dekker, T., *The Dramatic Works of T. D.*, Vol. III, ed. F. Bowers, revd., 413.
- Derrick, S. See Roper, D. (art.).
- Dickens, C. See Adrian, A. A.; Butt, J. (revd.).
- Dickey, F. M., *Not Wisely But Too Well. Shakespeare's Love Tragedies*, revd., 86.
- Digby, G. W., *Symbol and Image in William Blake*, revd., 202.
- Dilworth, E., note by, A Letter of Gibbon to Adam Smith, 401.
- Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica*. See Skelton, J. (revd.).
- Dobson, E. J. See Flint, M. K.
- Donne, J., *Progresse of the Soule*. See Murray, W. A. (art.). See Schanzer, E. (letter).
- Dryden, J. See Montgomery, G. (noticed); *Absalom and Achitophel*. See Maurer, W. (note).
- Dunn, T. A., *Philip Massinger. The Man and the Playwright*, revd., 198.
- Early English Text Society. See *Paris and Vienne*; Skelton, J. (revd.).
- Edwards, H. L. R. See Skelton, J.
- Eisner, S., *A Tale of Wonder. A Source Study of 'The Wife of Bath's Tale'*, revd., 406.
- Eliot, T. S., *On Poetry and Poets*, revd., 211. See Smith, G., Jr. (revd.).
- Enck, J. J., *Jonson and the Comic Truth*, revd., 306.
- Evans, E. See Percy, T. (revd.).
- Fairchild, H. N., *Religious Trends in English Poetry*, Vol. iv, 1830-80, revd., 97.
- Fêtes de la Renaissance, Les Études réunies et présentées par J. Jacquot*, noticed, 105.
- Firth, J. R., *Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951*, revd., 325.
- Flint, M. K., and Dobson, E. J., note by, Weak Masters, 58.
- Foakes, R. A. See Shakespeare, W., *King Henry VIII*.
- Foote, P. G. See *Saga of Gunnlaug*.
- Forman, S., 'Bocke of Plaies'. See Pafford, J. H. P. (note).
- Francklin, T. See Roper, D. (art.).
- Friedman, W. F. and E. S., *The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined*, revd., 88.
- Frye, N., *Anatomy of Criticism. Four Essays*, revd., 317.
- Fussell, P., Jr., note by, Speaker and Style in *A Letter of Advice to a Young Poet* (1721), and the Problem of Authorship, 63.
- Gardner, H. (ed.), *The Metaphysical Poets*, revd., 308.
- Gay, J. See Rawson, C. J. (art.).
- Gerstner-Hirzel, A., *The Economy of Action and Word in Shakespeare's Plays*, noticed, 107.
- Gibbon, E. See Dilworth, E. (note).
- Goldsmith, O., *Life of Parnell*. See Rawson, C. J. (art.).
- Greene, R., *Pandosto*. See Winny, J. (noticed).
- Greg, W. W. See Shakespeare, W., *Love's Labour's Lost*.
- Gregory, St., *Regula Pastoralis*. See Alfred, King.
- Gunnlaugs Saga. See *Saga of Gunnlaug* (revd.).
- Halverson, J., and Watt, I., art. by, The Original Nostromo: Conrad's Source, 45.
- Harlow, C. G., art. by, Punctuation in some manuscripts of Ælfric, 1.
- Haugh, R. F., *Joseph Conrad: Discovery in Design*, revd., 209.
- Hawkes, T., note by, 'Love' in *King Lear*, 178.
- Healey, G. H. See Wordsworth, W.
- Heilman, R. B., *Magic in the Web. Action and Language in 'Othello'*, noticed, 331.
- Henn, T. R., *The Harvest of Tragedy*, revd., 213.
- Hipple, W. J., Jr., *The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque in Eighteenth-century British Aesthetic Theory*, noticed, 217.
- Hogarth, G. See Adrian, A. A. (revd.).
- Housman, A. E. See Sparrow, J. (note).
- Hughes, M. See Milton, J.
- Hulme, H., art. by, Shakespeare of Stratford, 20.
- Hunter, G. K., note by, A Source for *The Revenger's Tragedy*, 181.
- Irving, W. H., *The Providence of Wit in the English Letter Writers*, noticed, 107.
- Jack Straw. The Life and Death of*, ed. K. Muir and F. P. Wilson (Malone Society), noticed, 330.
- Jackman, M. See Montgomery, G.
- Jackson, W. A. (ed.), *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602 to 1640*, revd., 91.
- Jacob and Esau*, ed. J. Crow and F. P. Wilson (Malone Society), revd., 83.
- Jacquot, J. See *Fêtes de la Renaissance*.
- James, H. See Levy, L. B. (revd.).
- Johnson, S. See Bloom, E. A. (revd.).
- Jonson, B. See Enck, J. J.; Musgrove, S. (revd.).

- Joyce, J. See Noon, S. J., W. T.; Schutte, W. M. (revd.).
- Junius, *Letters*. See Bowyer, T. H. (noticed).
- Keats, J. See Pettet, E. C. (revd.).
- Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, revd., 68. See Alfred, King, *The Pastoral Care*.
- Kinkad-Weekes, M., art. by, *Clarissa Restored?*, 156.
- Kuhn, S. M. See *Middle English Dictionary*.
- Kurath, H. See *Middle English Dictionary*.
- Landa, L. See Swift, J.
- Leach, M. See *Paris and Vienne*.
- Levin, H., *Contexts of Criticism*, revd., 103.
- Levy, L. B., *Versions of Melodrama. A Study of the Fiction and Drama of Henry James, 1865-1897*, revd., 100.
- Lewis, A. See Percy, T.
- 'Love is Life'. See Wilson, S. (art.).
- Lucretius. See Turner, P. (art.).
- Lyly, J., *Euphues*. See Winny, J. (noticed).
- Macaulay, T. B. See de Beer, E. S. (art.).
- McGrath, P. See Browne, J.
- McKenzie, D. F., art. by, *Shakespearean Punctuation—a New Beginning*, 361.
- Mahood, M. M., *Shakespeare's Wordplay*, revd., 85.
- Malone Society. *Collections IV*, revd., 83. See *Jacob and Esau* (revd.); *Jack Straw* (noticed).
- Margoliouth, H. M. See Blake, W., *Vala*.
- Massinger, P. See Dunn, T. A. (revd.).
- Maurer, W., note by, *Dryden's Balaam* Well Hung, 398.
- Middle English Dictionary*, ed. H. Kurath; associate editor S. M. Kuhn, Parts A 1-4, B 1-2, E 2-3, F 1-4, revd., 187.
- Middleton, T., *The Revenger's Tragedy*. See Hunter, G. K. (note).
- Midgley, G., note by, *The Wanderer*, ll. 49-55, 53.
- Miles, J., *Eras and Modes in English Poetry*, revd., 323.
- Miller, J. E., Jr., *A Critical Guide to 'Leaves of Grass'*, revd., 316.
- Milton, J., *Complete Poems and Major Prose*, ed. Hughes, noticed, 216; *Paradise Lost*. See Whiting, G. W.; Wright, B. A. (notes). See Schanzer, E. (letter); Stein, A.; Tuve, R. (revd.).
- Montgomery, G., assisted by M. Jackman and H. S. Agoa, *Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Dryden*, noticed, 216.
- Moorman, M., *William Wordsworth. A Biography. The Early Years 1770-1803*, revd., 94.
- More, T., *Utopia*. See Surtz, S. J., E. L.
- Morley, T., *Canzonets for Three Voices*, ed. J. E. Uhler, revd., 407.
- Moser, T., *Joseph Conrad. Achievement and Decline*, revd., 209.
- Muir, K., note by, *Shakespeare among the Commonplaces*, 283. See *Jack Straw*.
- Mulhauser, F. L. See Clough, A. H.
- Murdoch, P. See Roper, D. (art.).
- Murray, W. A., art. by, *What Was the Soul of the Apple?*, 141.
- Musgrove, S., note by, *The Birth of Pistol*, 56; *Shakespeare and Jonson*, revd., 306.
- Noon, S. J., W. T., *Joyce and Aquinas*, revd., 427.
- Nottingham Mediaeval Studies, ed. L. Thorpe, noticed, 104.
- Oxford Bibliographical Society. See Philip, I. G.
- Pafford, J. H. P., note by, *Simon Forman's 'Bocke of Plaies'*, 289.
- Paris and Vienne. Translated from the French and printed by William Caxton*, ed. M. Leach. (E.E.T.S. 234), revd., 82.
- Parnell, T. See Rawson, C. J. (art.).
- Peacock, R., *The Art of Drama*, revd., 431.
- Percy, T., *The Correspondence of T. P. and E. Evans*, ed. A. Lewis, revd., 417.
- Periodical Literature, Summary of, 109, 218, 333, 439.
- Pettet, E. C., *On the Poetry of Keats*, revd., 420.
- Philip, I. G., *William Blackstone and the Reform of the Oxford University Press in the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications 7), noticed, 331.
- Pinto, V. de S. See *Renaissance and Modern Studies*.
- Poe, E. A. See Davidson, E. H. (revd.).
- Pope, A. See Rawson, C. J. (art.).
- Purvis, J. S. See *York Cycle of Mystery Plays, The*.
- Publications Received, List of, 221, 442.
- Quirk, R. See *Bald's Leechbook; Saga of Gunnlaug*.
- Raleigh, J. H., *Matthew Arnold and American Culture*, revd., 424.
- Rawson, C. J., art. by, *Some Unpublished Letters of Pope and Gay*; and some Manuscript Sources of Goldsmith's *Life of Parnell*, 371.
- Read, H., *'The Tenth Muse'. Essays in Criticism*, revd., 433.
- Renaissance and Modern Studies*, ed. V. de S. Pinto, noticed, 106.
- Ribner, I., *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare*, revd., 409.

- Richardson, S., *Clarissa*. See Kinkead-Weekes, M. (art.).
- Roper, D., art. by, Smollett's 'Four Gentlemen': the First Contributors to the *Critical Review*, 38.
- Ross, D. J. A. See Cary, G.
- Rowell, G., *The Victorian Theatre. A Survey*, noticed, 108.
- Saga of Gunnlaug Serpent-Tongue, The*, ed. P. G. Foote, R. Quirk, revd., 297.
- Salter, F. M. See Skelton, J.
- Schanzer, E., letter by, *Verse and its Feet*, 292.
- Schnyder, H., *Die Wiederbelebung des Mittelalters im humoristischen Abbild*, noticed, 107.
- Schutte, W. M., *Joyce and Shakespeare. A Study in the Meaning of Ulysses*, revd., 427.
- Shakespeare, W., 2 *Henry IV*. See Musgrove, S. (note); *King Henry VIII*, ed. R. A. Foakes (Arden), revd., 195; *King Lear*. See Hawkes, T. (note); *Love's Labour's Lost 1598*, ed. W. Greg, noticed, 330; *Othello*. See Heilman, R. B. (noticed); *Richard III*. See Walton, J. K. (art.); Clemens, W. (revd.); *Tempest*. See Flint, M. K. (note); see Hulme, H.; McKenzie, D. F. (arts.); see Muir, K. (note); see Baldwin, T. W.; Bullough, G.; Dickey, F. M.; Friedman, W. F. and E. S.; Mahood, M. M., Musgrove, S.; Schutte, W. M.; Wilson, H. S. (revd.); See Gerstner-Hirzel, A.; Schnyder, H.; Tschopp, E. (noticed).
- Sharrock, R., art. by, *The Origin of A Relation of the Imprisonment of Mr. John Bunyan*, 250.
- Shelley, P. B. See Turner, P. (art.).
- Sherbo, A., *English Sentimental Drama*, revd., 200.
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. See d'Ardenne, S. R. T. O. (art.).
- Skelton, J., *The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus tr. J. S.*, ed. F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards, revd., 192.
- Smith, A. See Dilworth, E. (note).
- Smith, G., Jr., *T. S. Eliot's Poetry and Plays. A Study in Sources and Meaning*, revd., 101.
- Smith, J. N., note by, *Spenser's Prothalamion: a New Genre*, 173.
- Smollett, T. See Roper, D. (art.).
- Sparrow, J., note by, *A Housman 'Reminiscence'*, 183.
- Spenser, E., *Prothalamion*. See Smith, J. N. (note).
- Standop, E., *Syntax und Semantik der modalen Hilfsverben im Altenglischen*, revd., 186.
- Stationers' Company. See Jackson, W. A.
- Stein, A., *Heroic Knowledge. An Interpretation of 'Paradise Regained'*. See 'Samson Agonistes', revd., 415.
- Studies in Bibliography*, vol. xi, ed. F. Bowers, revd., 435.
- Surtz, S. J., E. L., *The Praise of Wisdom. A Commentary on the Religious and Moral Problems and Backgrounds of St. Thomas More's 'Utopia'*, revd., 301.
- Swift, J., *The Prose Writings of J. S. Vol. IV. A Proposal for Correcting the English Tongue, Polite Conversation, Etc.*, ed. H. Davis with L. Landa, noticed, 438; *A Letter of Advice to a Young Poet (1721)*. See Fussell, P., Jr. (note).
- Textus Roffensis*, Rochester Cathedral Library Manuscript A. 3.5 Part I, ed. P. Sawyer, revd., 403.
- Thomson, P., art. by, Wyatt and the Petrarchan Commentators, 225.
- Thorpe, L. See *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies*.
- Tilander, G., *Essais d'étymologie cynégétique; Nouveaux Essais d'étymologie cynégétique*; (ed.) *La Venerie de Twiti. Le plus ancien traité de chasse écrit en Angleterre. La Version anglaise du même traité et Craft of Venerie*, noticed, 105.
- Tillotson, K., *Matthew Arnold and Carlyle (Proc. Brit. Acad. xlii. 133-53)*, noticed, 108. See Butt, J.
- Todd, F. M., *Politics and the Poet. A Study of Wordsworth*, revd., 311.
- Tourneur, C., *The Revenger's Tragedy*. See Hunter, G. K. (note).
- Treatise of Perfection, The*. See *Chastising of God's Children, The* (revd.).
- Tschopp, E., *Zur Verteilung von Vers und Prosa in Shakespeares Dramen*, noticed, 107.
- Tucker, S. I., note by, *Sir Thopas and the Wild Beasts*, 54.
- Turner, P., art. by, *Shelley and Lucretius*, 269.
- Tuve, R., *Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton*, revd., 309.
- Twiti. See Tilander, G. (noticed).
- Uhler, J. E. See Morley, T.
- Urc, J. M. See *Benedictine Office, The*.
- Walton, J. K., art. by, *The Quarto Copy for the Folio Richard III, with rejoinder by A. S. Cairncross*, 127.
- Wanderer, The*. See Midgley, G. (note).
- Watt, I. See Halverson, J.
- Webster, J., *The White Devil*. See Boklund, G. (revd.).
- Whiting, G. W., note by, *'And without Thorn the Rose'*, 60.
- Whitman, W., *Leaves of Grass*. See Miller, J. E., Jr. (revd.).

- son, F. P. See *Jack Straw; Jacob and sau.*
- Wilson, H. S., *On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy*, revd., 86.
- Wilson, S., art. by, *The Longleat Version of 'Love is Life'*, 337.
- Winn, J. (ed.), *The Frame of Order. An Outline of Elizabethan Belief taken from Treatises of the Late Sixteenth Century*, noticed, 437; *Three Elizabethan Romance Stories; Euphues, Pandosto, Piers Plainness*, noticed, 329.
- Wordsworth, W., *The Cornell Wordsworth Collection. A Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts Presented to the University by Mr. Victor Emanuel, Cornell 1919*, compiled by G. H. Healey, revd., 418.
- See Moorman, M., Todd, F. M. (revd.).
- Wright, B. A., note by, *Paradise Lost*, ix, 1079-80, 62.
- Wright, C. E. See *Bald's Leechbook*.
- Wright, H. G., *Boccaccio in England from Chaucer to Tennyson*, revd., 78.
- Wulfstan, *Homilies*. See Bethurum, D. (revd.).
- Wyatt, T. See Thomson, P. (art.).
- York Cycle of Mystery Plays, The*, ed. J. S. Purvis, revd., 80.
- Zandvoort, R. W., and Assistants, *Wartime English. Materials for a Linguistic History of World War II*, noticed, 332.